arXiv:0706.4197v1 [math.GN] 28 Jun 2007

On the Theory of Relative Bitopological and Topological Properties

B. P. Dvalishvili

Department of Algebra-Geometry of the Institute of Mechanics and
Mathematics of the Faculty of Exact and Natural Sciences of
I. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University,
2, University St., 0143 Tbilisi, Georgia

1. Introduction

By analogy with [4], the leading idea, permeating the work, can be briefly described as follows: with each (bi)topological property $\mathcal{P}$ one can associate a relative version of it formulated in terms of location of a (bi)topological subspace Y in a (bi)topological space X in such a natural way that, when Y coincides with X, then the relative property coincides with $\mathcal{P}$. Moreover, please note that all bitopological versions are constructed in the commonly accepted manner so that if the topologies coincide, we obtain the original or new topological notions and results.

Observe also here that if after bitopological results their topological counterparts are also given, then this means that the counterparts are new too.

All useful notions have been collected and the following abbreviations are used throughout the work: TS for a topological space, TsS for a topological subspace, BS for a bitopological space and BsS for a bitopological subspace. Always. $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \neq j$, unless stated otherwise.

Let (X, τ_1, τ_2) be a BS and $\mathcal{P}$ be some topological property. Then (i, j)-$\mathcal{P}$ denotes the analogue of this property for τ_i with respect to τ_j, and p-$\mathcal{P}$ denotes the conjunction $(1, 2)$-$\mathcal{P} \wedge (2, 1)$-$\mathcal{P}$, that is, p-$\mathcal{P}$ denotes an "absolute" bitopological analogue of $\mathcal{P}$, where "p" is the abbreviation for "pairwise". Also note that (X, τ_i) has a property $\mathcal{P}$ if and only if (X, τ_1, τ_2) has the property i-$\mathcal{P}$, and d-$\mathcal{P}$ is equivalent to 1-$\mathcal{P} \wedge 2$-$\mathcal{P}$, where "d" is the abbreviation for "double". A BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) has a property $\mathcal{P}$ if and only if (Y, τ_1', τ_2') has the property $\mathcal{P}$ in itself.

As usual, the symbol 2^X is used for the power set of the set X, and for a family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_s\}_{s \in S} \subset 2^X$, $\operatorname{co} \mathcal{A}$ denotes the conjugate family $\{X \setminus A_s,\ A_s \in \mathcal{A}\}_{s \in S}$. If $A \subset X$, then $\tau_i \operatorname{int} A$ and $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} A$ denote respectively interiors and closures of A in the topologies τ_i (for a TS (X, τ) the interior and the closure of a subset $A \subset X$ is denoted by

$\tau\operatorname{int}A$ and $\tau\operatorname{cl}A$, respectively). A set $A\subset X$ is p-closed in (X,τ_1,τ_2) if $A=\tau_1\operatorname{cl}A\cap\tau_2\operatorname{cl}A$ and the family of all p-closed subsets of (X,τ_1,τ_2) is denoted by $p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$. It is clear, that $\operatorname{co}\tau_1\cup\operatorname{co}\tau_2\subset p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$ and for $\tau_1\subset\tau_2$, that is, for a BS $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$, $p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)=\operatorname{co}\tau_2$.

A family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}=\{U_s\}_{s\in S}$ of subsets of X is a p-open covering of X if $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}\subset\tau_1\cup\tau_2$, $X=\bigcup\limits_{s\in S}U_s$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}\cap\tau_i$ contains a nonempty set [11].

In our further discussion $(\mathbb{R},\omega)$ is the natural TS, and the natural BS $(\mathbb{R},\omega_1,\omega_2)$ is the real line $\mathbb{R}$ with the lower $\omega_1=\{\varnothing,\mathbb{R}\}\cup\big\{(a,+\infty):\ a\in\mathbb{R}\big\}$ and upper $\omega_2=\{\varnothing,\mathbb{R}\}\cup\big\{(-\infty,a):\ a\in\mathbb{R}\big\}$ topologies.

A function $f:(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)\to(Y,\gamma_1,\gamma_2)$ is said to be d-continuous if the induced functions $f:(X,\tau_i)\to(Y,\gamma_i)$ are continuous. Following [8], "lower (upper) semicontinuous" is abbreviated to l.(u.).s.c. and by Proposition 0.1.4 in [8], a function $f:(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)\to(I,\omega_1',\omega_2')$ is d-continuous if and only if $f:(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)\to(I,\omega')$ is (i,j)-l.u.s.c., where $f:(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)\to(I,\omega')$ is (i,j)-l.u.s.c. if f is i-l.s.c. and j-u.s.c.

We shall also use the following double indexation

$$A_j^i=\big\{x\in A:\ x\text{ is a }j\text{-isolated point of }A\big\},$$

where "j" denotes the belonging to the topology, while "i" is fixed as the isolation symbol. By [6], for any subset A of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) the (i,j)-boundaries (i.e., bitopological boundaries) of A are the p-closed sets $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}A=\tau_i\operatorname{cl}A\cap\tau_j\operatorname{cl}(X\setminus A)$.

Furthermore, in a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) the topology τ_1 is coupled to the topology τ_2 (briefly, $\tau_1C\tau_2$) if $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U\subseteq\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U$ for any set $U\in\tau_1$ [27], τ_1 is near τ_2 (briefly, $\tau_1N\tau_2$) if $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U\subseteq\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U$ for any set $U\in\tau_2$ [8], and τ_1 and τ_2 are S-related (briefly, $\tau_1S\tau_2$) if

$$\tau_1\operatorname{int}A\subset\tau_1\operatorname{cl}\tau_2\operatorname{int}A\wedge\tau_2\operatorname{int}A\subset\tau_2\operatorname{cl}\tau_1\operatorname{int}A$$

for any subset $A\subset X$ [25].

In the sequel it will be assumed that

$$\big(\tau_1C\tau_2\wedge\tau_1\subset\tau_2\big)\Longleftrightarrow\tau_1<_C\tau_2,$$
$$\big(\tau_1N\tau_2\wedge\tau_1\subset\tau_2\big)\Longleftrightarrow\tau_1<_N\tau_2\ \text{ and }\ \big(\tau_1S\tau_2\wedge\tau_1\subset\tau_2\big)\Longleftrightarrow\tau_1<_S\tau_2.$$

By [8], $i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)=\big\{A\subset X:\ \tau_i\operatorname{cl}A=X\big\}$, $i\text{-}\mathcal{B}d(X)=\operatorname{co}i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)=\{A\subset X:\ \tau_i\operatorname{int}A=\varnothing\}$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(X)=\big\{A\subset X:\ A=\tau_i\operatorname{cl}\tau_j\operatorname{int}A\big\}.$$

Definition 1.1. let (X,τ_1,τ_2) be BS. Then

(1) (X,τ_1,τ_2) is R-p-T_1 (i.e., p-T_1 in the sense of Reilly) if it is d-T_1 [20].

(2) (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i, j)-regular if for each point $x \in X$ and each i-closed set F, $x \overline{\in} F$, there exist an i-open set U and a j-open set V such that $x \in U$, $F \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$ [13] and by (2) of Proposition 0.1.7 in [8], (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i, j)-regular if and only if for each point $x \in X$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there exists a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$.

(3) (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i, j)-Tychonoff if it is $\mathrm{R}\text{-}p\text{-}\mathrm{T}_1$ and (i, j)-completely regular, that is, for every i-closed set $F \subset X$ and any point $x \in X$, $x \overline{\in} F$, there is an $(i.j)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega')$ such that $f(F) = 0$ and $f(x) = 1$ [14].

(4) (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-normal if for every pair of disjoint sets A, B in X, where A is 1-closed and B is 2-closed, there exist a 2-open set U and a 1-open set V such that $A \subset U$, $B \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$ [13] and by (4) of Proposition 0.1.7 in [8], (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-normal if and only if for each 2-closed (1-closed) set F and each 1-open (2-open) set U with $F \subset U$, there exists a 1-open (2-open) set V such that $F \subset V \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V \subset U$ ($F \subset V \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V \subset U$).

(5) (X, τ_1, τ_2) is hereditarily p-normal if every one of its BsS is p-normal [6] and by Theorem 0.2.2 in [8], (X, τ_1, τ_2) is hereditarily p-normal if and only if whenever $A, B \subset X$, $(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap B) \cup (A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B) = \varnothing$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$.

(6) (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i, j)-R R-paracompact if for each i-open covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ of X there is an i-open covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ of X which refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and is j-locally finite at each point of X [18].

(7) A BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-connected if X cannot be expressed as the union of two nonempty sets A and B such that $(A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B) \cup (\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap B) = \varnothing$ [17] and by (c) of Theorem A and Theorem C in [17], respectively, the p-connectedness of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is equivalent to each of the following two conditions: X contains no nonempty subset which is both 1-open and 2-closed (hence, none which is 1-closed and 2-open), and every d-continuous function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (R, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ has the Darboux property, that is, if $f(x_1) < c < f(x_2)$, then there is $x \in X$ such that $f(x) = c$.

In the first part of the work (Sections 2–6) a special attention is given to relative separation axioms and relative connectedness, in particular, many relative versions of $p\text{-}\mathrm{T}_0$, $p\text{-}\mathrm{T}_1$, $p\text{-}\mathrm{T}_2$, (i, j)- and p-regularities, (i, j)- and p-complete regularities, p-real normality and p-normality are discussed. Moreover, relative properties of (i, j)- and p-compactness types, including relative versions of (i,j)- and p-paracompactness, (i,j)- and p-Lindelöfness, (i,j)- and p-pseudocompactness are also introduced and investigated. The second part (Sections 7–12) is devoted, on the one hand, to relative bitopological inductive and covering dimension functions and, on the other hand, to relative versions of Baire spaces for both the topological and the bitopological case.

At the end, note that relative (bi)topological properties play a special role not only in the development of respective theories, but also in the strengthening of the previously known results.

2. Relative Separation Axioms

First of all, note that topological versions of relative bitopological properties, introduced and studied in Sections 2–6, are considered, in particular, in [2]–[4].

Below, the letters "W" and "S" abbreviate, respectively, the words "weakly" and "strongly".

Definition 2.1. Let (Y,τ_1',τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2). Then

(1) Y is p-T_0 in X if for every pair of distinct point of Y there exists a 1-neighborhood or a 2-neighborhood in X of one point, not containing the other.

(2) Y is WS-T_0 in X if for each pair of distinct points $y\in Y$, $x\in X$ there exists a 1-neighborhood or a 2-neighborhood of y in Y, not containing x, or there exists a 1- or 2-neighborhood of x in X, not containing y.

(3) Y is $\mathrm{W}\,p$-R_0 in X of for every set $U\in\tau_1\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ it follows from $x\in U\cap Y$ that $\tau_2'\operatorname{cl}\{x\}\subset U$ and for every set $V\in\tau_2\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ it follows from $y\in V\cap Y$ that $\tau_1'\operatorname{cl}\{y\}\subset V$.

(4) Y is p-R_0 in X of for every set $U\in\tau_1\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ it follows from $x\in U\cap Y$ that $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}\{x\}\subset U$ and for every set $V\in\tau_2\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ it follows from $y\in V\cap Y$ that $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}\{y\}\subset V$.

(5) Y is $\mathrm{W}\,p$-T_1 in X if for any pair of distinct points of Y one point has a 1-neighborhood in X not containing the other, while the other point has a 2-neighborhood in X, not containing the first.

(6) Y is p-T_1 in X if for every pair of distinct points x, $y\in Y$ there exists a 1- or a 2-neighborhood of x in X, not containing y.

(7) Y is $\mathrm{S}\,p$-T_1 in X if for every pair of distinct points x, $y\in Y$ there exists a 1- and a 2-neighborhood of x in X, not containing y.

(8) Y is (i,j)-WS-T$_1$ in X of for every pair of distinct points $y \in Y$, $x \in X$ there exist an i-neighborhood of y in Y, not containing x, and a j-neighborhood of x in X, not containing y.

(9) Y is (i,j)-W-R$_1$ in X if for each pair of distinct points x, $y \in Y$ such that $x \,\overline{\in}\, \tau_i \operatorname{cl}\{y\}$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(x) \in \tau_i$ and $U(y) \in \tau_j$.

(10) Y is (i,j)-R$_1$ in X if for each pair of distinct points x, $y \in Y$ such that $x \,\overline{\in}\, \tau_i' \operatorname{cl}\{y\}$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(x) \in \tau_i$ and $U(y) \in \tau_j$.

(11) Y is (i,j)-WS-R$_1$ in X if for each pair of distinct points $y \in Y$, $x \in X$ such that $y \,\overline{\in}\, \tau_i \operatorname{cl}\{x\}$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(y) \in \tau_i'$ and $U(x) \in \tau_j$.

(12) Y is (i,j)-SW-R$_1$ in X if for each pair of distinct points $y \in Y$, $x \in X$ such that $x \,\overline{\in}\, \tau_i' \operatorname{cl}\{y\}$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(y) \in \tau_j'$ and $U(x) \in \tau_i$.

(13) Y is W p-R$_1$ in X if for each pair of distinct points x, $y \in Y$ such that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl}\{x\} \neq \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}\{y\}$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(x) \in \tau_2$ and $U(y) \in \tau_1$.

(14) Y is S p-R$_1$ in X if for each pair of distinct points x, $y \in Y$ such that $\tau_1' \operatorname{cl}\{x\} \neq \tau_2' \operatorname{cl}\{y\}$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(x) \in \tau_2$ and $U(y) \in \tau_1$.

(15) Y is W p-T$_2$ in X if for each pair of distinct points x, $y \in Y$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_1$, $V \in \tau_2$ such that either $x \in U$, $y \in V$ or $x \in V$, $y \in U$.

(16) Y is p-T$_2$ in X if for each pair of distinct points x, $y \in Y$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_1$, $V \in \tau_2$ such that $x \in U$ and $y \in V$.

(17) Y is (i,j)-WS-T$_2$ in X if for each pair of distinct points $y \in Y$, $x \in X$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(y) \in \tau_i'$ and $U(x) \in \tau_j$.

(18) Y is (i,j)-S-T$_2$ in X if for each pair of distinct points $y \in Y$, $x \in X$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(y) \in \tau_i$ and $U(x) \in \tau_j$.

Furthermore, we pass to the bitopological modifications of various types of relative regularity, relative complete regularity and relative normality.

Definition 2.2. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then

(1) Y is (i,j)-WS-quasi regular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i$ and $x \,\overline{\in}\, F$, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_i'$, $V \in \tau_j'$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \cap Y \subset V$.

(2) Y is (i,j)-regular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i$ and $x \,\overline{\in}\, F$, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \cap Y \subset V$.

(3) Y is (i,j)-strongly regular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_i$ and $x \overline{\in} F$, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \subset V$.
(4) Y is (i,j)-superregular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \overline{\in} F$, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \subset V$.
(5) Y is (i,j)-WS-regular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \overline{\in} F$, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau'_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \cap Y \subset V$.
(6) Y is (i,j)-WS-superregular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \overline{\in} F$, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau'_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \subset V$.
(7) Y is (i,j)-free regular in X if for $x \in X$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \overline{\in} F$, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \cap Y \subset V$.

It is obvious that taking into account (2) of Definition 1.1, for a BsS (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) the following implications hold:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-regular} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-free regular in } X \arrow[dd, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-superregular in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \arrow[dr, Rightarrow] & \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-WS-superregular in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-strongly regular in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-WS-regular in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \arrow[dr, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-regular in } X \arrow[l, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-regular} & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-WS-quasi regular in } X \arrow[l, Rightarrow]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Using (2) of Definition 1.1 one can reformulate three axioms of bitopological relative regularity.

Proposition 2.3. *Let* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). *Then*

(1) Y *is* (i,j)*-strongly regular in* X *if and only if for each point* $x \in Y$ *and any neighborhood* $U'(x) \in \tau'_i$ *there is a neighborhood* $V(x) \in \tau_i$ *such that* $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \cap Y \subset U'(x)$.
(2) Y *is* (i,j)-WS*-superregular in* X *if and only if for each point* $x \in Y$ *and each neighborhood* $U(x) \in \tau_i$ *there is a neighborhood* $V'(x) \in \tau'_i$ *such that* $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U(x)$.

(3) *Y is (i,j)-superregular in X if and only if for each point $x \in Y$ and each neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$.*

Proof. (1) Let, first, Y be (i,j)-strongly regular in X, $x \in Y$ and $U'(x) \in \tau_i'$. Then $x \overline{\in} A = Y \setminus U'(x)$, $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i'$. Hence, there are $V(x) \in \tau_i$, $V(A) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \cap V(A) = \varnothing$, Clearly,

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset X \setminus V(A) \subset X \setminus A = X \setminus (Y \setminus U'(x)) = U'(x) \cup (X \setminus Y)$$

and thus $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \cap Y \subset U'(x)$.

Conversely, let the condition be satisfied, $x \in Y$, $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i'$ and $x \overline{\in} A$. Then $x \in Y \setminus A = U'(x) \in \tau_i'$ and hence, there is $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \cap Y \subset U'(x)$. Therefore

$$X \setminus U'(x) \subset X \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \cap Y) = (X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x)) \cup (X \setminus Y)$$

so that $(X \setminus U'(x)) \cap Y \subset X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x)$. Thus $A \subset X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) = V(A) \in \tau_j$ and $V(x) \cap V(A) = \varnothing$.

(2) Let, first, Y be (i,j)-WS-superregular in X, $x \in Y$ and $U(x) \in \tau_i$. Then $x \overline{\in} F = X \setminus U(x) \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i$ and so, there are $V(x) \in \tau_i'$, $V(F) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \cap V(F) = \varnothing$. Therefore,

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset X \setminus V(F) \subset X \setminus F = U(x).$$

Conversely, let the condition be satisfied, $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i$ and $x \overline{\in} F$. Then $x \in U(x) = X \setminus F \in \tau_i$ and by condition, there is $V(x) \in \tau_i'$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$. Hence

$$F = X \setminus U(x) \subset X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) = V(F) \in \tau_j$$

and $V(x) \cap V(F) = \varnothing$.

(3) Follows directly from (2) of Definition 1.1, taking into account that $x \in Y$.

Hence, Y is (i,j)-superregular in X if and only if X is (i,j)-regular at each point of Y. $\square$

It is evident that a TsS (Y, τ') of a TS (X, τ) is WS-regular (WS-superregular) in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co} \tau$ and $x \overline{\in} F$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau'$, $V \in \tau$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \cap Y \subset V (F \subset V)$.

Therefore, the topological version of Proposition 2.3 says that (Y, τ') is strongly regular (respectively, WS-superregular, superregular) in X if and only if for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U'(x) \in \tau'$ (respectively, $U(x) \in \tau$) there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau$ (respectively, $V'(x) \in \tau'$, $V(x) \in \tau$) such that $\tau \operatorname{cl} V(x) \cap Y \subset U'(x)$ (respectively, $\tau \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U(x)$, $\tau \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$).

Definition 2.4. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then

(1) Y is (i,j)-regular in X from inside if every i-closed in X BsS of Y is (i,j)-regular.

(2) Y is (i,j)-internally regular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, $F \subset Y$ and $x \overline{\in} F$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \subset V$.

(3) X is (i,j)-regular on Y if for each set $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, i-concentrated on Y (that is $F \subset \tau_i \operatorname{cl}(F \cap Y)$ [3]), and each point $x \in Y \setminus F$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \subset V$.

(4) X is (i,j)-strongly regular on Y if for each $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, i-concentrated on Y, and each point $x \in X \setminus F$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \subset V$.

Proposition 2.5. *Let* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). *Then*

(1) *If* Y *is* (i,j)*-regular, then* Y *is* (i,j)*-regular from inside in* X *and so, in every larger* BS.

(2) *If* Y *is* (i,j)*-internally regular in* X*, then* Y *is* (i,j)*-regular in* X *from inside.*

Proof. (1) The condition is obvious since if Y is (i,j)-regular, then any BsS of Y is also (i,j)-regular.

(2) Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, $F \subset Y$ and let us prove that (F, τ_1'', τ_2'') is (i,j)-regular. If $x \in F$, $\Phi \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i''$, $x \overline{\in} \Phi$, then $x \in Y$ and $\Phi \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ as $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$. Since $x \in Y$, $\Phi \subset Y$, $\Phi \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, $x \overline{\in} \Phi$ and Y is (i,j)-internally regular in X, there are $U' \in \tau_i$, $V' \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U'$, $\Phi \subset V'$ and $U' \cap V' = \varnothing$. Let $U = U' \cap F$, $V = V' \cap F$. Then $U \in \tau_i''$, $V \in \tau_j''$, $x \in U$, $\Phi \subset U$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. Thus (F, τ_1'', τ_2'') is (i,j)-regular. ☐

Note here that a real-valued function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega')$ is Y-(i,j)-l.u.s.c. if it is (i,j)-l.u.s.c. at each point $y \in Y$, where (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2).

Definition 2.6. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then

(1) Y is (i,j)-almost completely regular in X if for each point $x \in Y$ and each set $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$, $x \overline{\in} F$, there is a Y-(j,i)-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(x) = 0$ and $f(F) \subset \{1\}$.

(2) Y is (i,j)-completely regular in X if for each point $x \in Y$ and each set $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, $x \overline{\in} F$, there is a (j,i)-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(x) = 0$ and $f(F \cap Y) \subset \{1\}$.

(3) Y is (i,j)-strongly completely regular in X if for each point $x \in Y$ and each set $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, $x \overline{\in} F$, there is a (j,i)-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(x) = 0$ and $f(F) \subset \{1\}$.

Therefore, Y is (i,j)-strongly completely regular in $X \Longrightarrow Y$ is (i,j)-completely regular in $X \Longrightarrow Y$ is (i,j)-almost completely regular in X.

Proposition 2.7. *A* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* (i,j)*-almost completely regular in* X *if and only if for each point* $x \in Y$ *and any set* $U \in \tau_i$, $x \in U$ *there is a* Y*-*(i,j)*-l.u.s.c. function* $g : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ *such that* $g(x) = 1$ *and* $g(X \setminus U) \subset \{0\}$.

Proof. If $P = X \setminus U$, then $P \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $F = P \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$. Since $x \overline{\in} F$ and Y is (i,j)-almost completely regular, there is a Y-(j,i)-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(x) = 0$ and $f(F) \subset \{1\}$. If $g' = 1 - f$, then $g' : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ is Y-(i,j)-l.u.s.c., $g'(x) = 1$ and $g'(F) \subset \{0\}$. Let $g(x) = g'(x)$ at each point $x \in U$ and $g(x) = 0$ at each point $x \in P = X \setminus U$. Then $g : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ is Y-(i,j)-l.u.s.c., $g(x) = 1$ and $g(X \setminus U) \subset \{0\}$.

Conversely, let the condition be satisfied and $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$, $x \overline{\in} F$. Then $x \overline{\in} \tau_i \operatorname{cl} F = P \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and so $x \in U = X \setminus P$. Hence, by condition, there is a Y-(i,j)-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(x) = 1$ and $f(X \setminus U) \subset \{0\}$. Clearly $g = 1 - f$ is Y-(j,i)-l.u.s.c., $g(x) = 0$ and

$$g(F) \subset g(P) = 1 - f(P) = 1 - f(X \setminus U) = \{1\},$$

that is, Y is (i,j)-almost completely regular in X. $\square$

Definition 2.8. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then

(1) Y is p-quasi normal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2'$, $V \in \tau_1'$ such that $A \cap Y \subset U$ and $B \cap Y \subset V$.

(2) Y is p-normal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \cap Y \subset U$ and $B \cap Y \subset V$.

(3) Y is p-strongly normal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$.

(4) Y is (i,j)-supernormal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_j$, $V \in \tau_i$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$.

(5) Y is (i,j)-WS-normal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_j'$, $V \in \tau_i$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \cap Y \subset V$.

(6) Y is (i,j)-WS-supernormal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_j'$, $V \in \tau_i$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$ [9].

In general, the p-normality of (Y,τ_1',τ_2') in (X,τ_1,τ_2) does not imply the p-normality of (Y,τ_1',τ_2'). Nevertheless, if (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is p-normal in a R-p-T$_1$ BS (X,τ_1,τ_2), then (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is p-regular. Indeed, let $x\in Y$, $F\in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ and $x\,\overline{\in}\,F$. Then $x\,\overline{\in}\,\tau_i\operatorname{cl}F$ and by condition there are disjoint sets $U(x)\in\tau_i$ and $U(\tau_i\operatorname{cl}F)\in\tau_j$. Clearly, $U'(x)=U(x)\cap Y\in\tau_i'$ and $U'(F)=U(\tau_i\operatorname{cl}F)\cap Y\in\tau_j'$ are also disjoint, and hence, (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is p-regular.

Proposition 2.9. *Let (Y,τ_1',τ_2') be a* BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2). *Then*

(1) *Y is p-strongly normal in X if and only if for each set $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ ($F\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$) and any neighborhood $U'(F)\in\tau_2'$ ($U'(F)\in\tau_1'$) there is a neighborhood $V(F)\in\tau_2$ ($V(F)\in\tau_1$) such that $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}V(F)\cap Y\subset U'(F)$ ($\tau_2\operatorname{cl}V(F)\cap Y\subset U'(F)$).*

(2) *Y is (i,j)-*WS*-supernormal in X if and only if for each set $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ and any neighborhood $U(F)\in\tau_j$ there is a neighborhood $V(F)\in\tau_j'$ such that $\tau_i\operatorname{cl}V(F)\subset U(F)$.*

(3) *Y is (i,j)-supernormal in X if and only if for each set $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ and any neighborhood $U(F)\in\tau_j$ there is a neighborhood $V(F)\in\tau_j$ such that $\tau_i\operatorname{cl}V(F)\subset U(F)$.*

Proof. (1) Let, first, Y be p-strongly normal in X, $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ and $U'(F)\in\tau_2'$. Then $\Phi=(X\setminus U(F))\cap Y$, where $U(F)\in\tau_i$, $U(F)\cap Y=U'(F)$, $\Phi\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $F\cap\Phi=\varnothing$. Hence there are $V(F)\in\tau_2$, $V(\Phi)\in\tau_1$ such that $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}V(F)\cap V(\Phi)=\varnothing$ and so

$$V(F)\subset\tau_1\operatorname{cl}V(F)\subset X\setminus V(\Phi)\subset X\setminus\Phi=U(F)\cup(X\setminus Y).$$

Therefore, $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}V(F)\cap Y\subset U'(F)$.

Conversely, let the condition be satisfied, $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Then $A\subset Y\setminus B=U'(A)\in\tau_2'$ and by condition there is $V(A)\in\tau_2$ such that $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}V(A)\cap Y\subset U'(A)$. Hence

$$X\setminus U'(A)\subset X\setminus(\tau_1\operatorname{cl}V(A)\cap Y)=(X\setminus\tau_1\operatorname{cl}V(A))\cup(X\setminus Y)$$

and so $(X\setminus U'(A))\cap Y\subset X\setminus\tau_1\operatorname{cl}V(A)$, i.e., $B=Y\setminus U'(A)\subset(X\setminus\tau_1\operatorname{cl}V(A))=V(B)\in\tau_1$ and $V(A)\cap V(B)=\varnothing$.

The case in the brackets can be proved by the similar manner.

(2) Let, first, Y be (i,j)-WS-supernormal in X, $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ and $U(A)\in\tau_j$. Then $A\cap B=\varnothing$, where $B=X\setminus U(A)\in\operatorname{co}\tau_j$. Hence there are $V(A)\in\tau_j'$, $V(B)\in\tau_i$ such that $\tau_i\operatorname{cl}V(A)\cap V(B)=\varnothing$ and thus

$$V(A)\subset\tau_i\operatorname{cl}V(A)\subset X\setminus V(B)\subset X\setminus B=U(A).$$

Conversely, let the condition be satisfied, $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_j$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Then $A\subset U(A)=X\setminus B\in\tau_j$. Hence, by condition, there is $V(A) \in \tau'_j$ such that $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} V(A) \subset U(A)$. Therefore,

$$B = X \setminus U(A) \subset X \setminus \tau_i \operatorname{cl} V(A) = V(B) \in \tau_i$$

and $V(A) \cap V(B) = \varnothing$.

(3) This proof is similar to the proof of (2) and can be omitted. $\square$

Now, taking into account the topological version of (i,j)-strong normality, given in [2], and the topological versions of (i,j)-WS-supernormality and (i,j)-supernormality, we come to

Corollary 2.10. *Let* (Y, τ') *be a* TsS *of a* TS (X, τ). *Then*

1. Y *is strongly normal in* X *if and only if for each set* $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau'$ *and any neighborhood* $U(F) \in \tau'$ *there is a neighborhood* $V(F) \in \tau$ *such that* $\tau \operatorname{cl} V(F) \cap Y \subset U(F)$.
2. Y *is* WS-*supernormal in* X *if and only if for each set* $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau'$ *and any neighborhood* $U(F) \in \tau$ *there is a neighborhood* $V(F) \in \tau'$ *such that* $\tau \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$.
3. Y *is supernormal in* X *if and only if for each set* $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau'$ *and any neighborhood* $U(F) \in \tau$ *there is a neighborhood* $V(F) \in \tau$ *such that* $\tau \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$.

Definition 2.11. Let (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then

1. Y is p-normal in X from inside if every p-closed in X BsS of Y is p-normal.
2. Y is p-internally normal in X if for each pair of disjoint subsets $A, B \subset Y$, where $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$.
3. X is p-normal on Y if for each pair of disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, where $A \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$ and $B \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y)$, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$.

It is obvious that taking into account (4) of Definition 1.1, for a BsS (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) we have the following implications

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \text{ is } p\text{-norm.} \arrow[r, Rightarrow, "Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i"] \arrow[dd, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-supernorm. in } X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[dd, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-WS-supernorm. in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
 & & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-WS-norm. in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } p\text{-norm. in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \arrow[dr, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } p\text{-strong. norm. in } X \arrow[l, Rightarrow] \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } p\text{-norm.} \arrow[dl, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } p\text{-intern. norm. in } X & Y \text{ is } p\text{-quasi norm. in } X & Y \text{ is } p\text{-norm. in } X \text{ from ins.}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Therefore, if Y is p-normal, then Y is p-quasi normal in any larger BS, but Y is not p-normal in a larger BS. Besides, any BsS Y of a hereditarily p-normal BS X is p-strongly normal in X and hence, Y is p-normal in X, Y is p-quasi normal in X, Y is p-internally normal in X and Y is p-normal in X from inside.

Note also here that if X is $\mathrm{R}\text{-}p\text{-}\mathrm{T}_1$ and p-normal on Y, then X is p-regular on Y, but X is not $(1,2)$-strongly regular on Y nor $(2,1)$-strongly regular on Y. Indeed, if $x \in (X \setminus F) \cup (X \setminus Y)$, then $\{x\}$ is not 1-concentrated on Y nor 2-concentrated on Y.

Remark 2.12. First, note that if $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ in a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) and $Y \subset X$, then F is i-concentrated on Y if and only if there is a subset $A \subset Y$ such that $F = \tau_i \operatorname{cl} A$ [3]. Similarly, it is easily to see that if $A \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$, then A is p-concentrated on Y, that is,

$$A \subset p\text{-}\operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$$

if and only if there is a subset $B \subset Y$ such that $A = p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} B$. Therefore, if A is i-concentrated (p–concentrated) on an i-closed (a p-closed) subset $Y \subset X$, then $A \subset Y$. Indeed, $A \subset \tau_i \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$ $(A \subset p\text{-}\operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y))$ implies that $A \subset \tau_i \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y$ $(A \subset p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)$ and so $A \subset Y$.

Furthermore, if (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) and $Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$, then $p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y) \subset p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$. Hence, for $T \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$ and for any set $A \subset T \cap Y$ we have $A \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(T \cap Y) \iff A \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y)$.

Indeed, let $A = \tau_1' \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2' \operatorname{cl} A$ and $Y = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y$. Then

$$\begin{gathered} A = (\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \cap (\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) = \\ = \big(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y\big) \cap \big(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y\big) = \\ = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} A, \end{gathered}$$

i.e., $p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y) \subset p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$.

Now, let $T \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$. First, suppose that $A \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(T \cap Y)$. Since $T \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$, the set $T \cap Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y)$. Hence, $A \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(T \cap Y)$ and $T \cap Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y)$ imply that $A \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y)$. Conversely, if $A \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y)$, then $A \subset T \cap Y$ implies that $A \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(T \cap Y)$.

Proposition 2.13. *Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). *Then*

(1) *If Y is p-normal, then Y is p-normal in X from inside and so it is p-normal from inside in every larger* BS.

(2) *If $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and Y is p-internally normal in X, then Y is p-normal in X from inside.*

(3) *X is p-normal on Y if and only if for any pair of subsets $A, B \subset Y$ such that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = \varnothing$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \subset U$ and $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \subset V$.*

Proof. (1) Let $F \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$ and $F \subset Y$. Then $F \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y)$ and since Y is p-normal, by Corollary 3.2.6 in [8], F is also p-normal.

(2) Let $Y \subset X$, $F \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$ and $F \subset Y$. Then $F \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y)$ and for $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1''$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2''$ in (F, τ_1'', τ_2''), $A \cap B = \varnothing$, by Lemma 3.2.5 in [8], there are $A' \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B' \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ such that $A' \cap B' = \varnothing$, $A' \cap F = A$ and $B' \cap F = B$. Since $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, it is obvious that $A' \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B' \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and hence, by condition, there are disjoint sets $U' \in \tau_2$, $V' \in \tau_1$ such that $A' \subset U'$ and $B' \subset V'$. Now, if $U = U' \cap F$, $V = V' \cap F$, then $U \in \tau_2''$, $V \in \tau_1''$, $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$. Thus (F, τ_1'', τ_2'') is p-normal.

(3) Let, first, X be p-normal on Y, $A, B \subset Y$ and $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = \varnothing$. Then, by Remark 2.12, $F_1 = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, F_1 is 1-concentrated on Y, $F_2 = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and F_2 is 2-concentrated on Y. Since X is p-normal on Y, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $F_1 = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \subset U$ and $F_2 = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \subset V$.

Conversely, let the condition be satisfied, $F_1 \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ be 1-concentrated on Y, $F_2 \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ be 2-concentrated on Y and $F_1 \cap F_2 = \varnothing$. Then by Remark 2.12 there are $A, B \subset Y$ such that $F_1 = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A$ and $F_2 = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B$. Hence, it remains to use the condition. □

Definition 2.14. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then

1. Y is p-weakly realnormal in X if for every pair of disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ there is a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A \cap Y) \subset \{0\}$ and $f(B \cap Y) \subset \{1\}$.
2. Y is p-realnormal in X if for every pair of nonempty disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A) = \{0\}$ and $f(B) = \{1\}$.
3. Y is p-strongly realnormal in X if for every pair of nonempty disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ and $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A) = \{0\}$ and $f(B) = \{1\}$.
4. Y is p-super strongly realnormal in X if for every pair of nonempty disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ and $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ there is a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A) = \{0\}$ and $f(B) = \{1\}$.
5. X is p-realnormal on Y if for every pair of disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ there is a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A \cap Y) \subset \{0\}$ and $f(B \cap Y) \subset \{1\}$.

Proposition 2.15. *For a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *Y is p-realnormal in X.*
(2) *For every pair of nonempty subsets $A, B \subset Y$, where $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = \varnothing$ there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A) \subset \{0\}$ and $f(B) \subset \{1\}$.*
(3) *For every pair of nonempty disjoint sets $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1$ and $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2$ there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A \cap Y) \subset \{0\}$ and $f(B \cap Y) \subset \{1\}$.*

Proof. (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) is obvious.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3). Let $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A = A$, $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y) \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = B$ and by (2), there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A \cap Y) \subset \{0\}$ and $f(B \cap Y) \subset \{1\}$.

(3) $\Longrightarrow$ (1). Let $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $\varphi : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $\varphi(A \cap Y) \subset \{0\}$ and $\varphi(B \cap Y) \subset \{1\}$. Let us define a new function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ as follows: $f(A) = \{0\}$, $f(B) = \{1\}$ and $f\big|_{X \setminus (A \cup B)} = \varphi\big|_{X \setminus (A \cup B)}$. Then, it is clear, that f is Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c., and thus (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (1). □

Clearly, take place the following implications:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & Y \text{ is } p\text{-super strongly realnormal in } X \arrow[dl, Rightarrow] \arrow[dr, Rightarrow] & \\
Y \text{ is } p\text{-strongly realnormal in } X \arrow[dr, Rightarrow] & & X \text{ is } p\text{-realnormal on } Y \arrow[dl, Rightarrow] \\
 & Y \text{ is } p\text{-realnormal in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & \\
 & Y \text{ is } p\text{-weakly realnormal in } X &
\end{tikzcd}$$

The rest of the section is devoted to some special notions and results, which together with their applications have an independent interest too.

First, let us prove an elementary, but very important

Lemma 2.16. *If $Y \in i$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$ in a* BS *$(X, \tau_1 <_S \tau_2)$, then for any set $U \in \tau_i$ we have $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U = \tau_j \operatorname{cl}(U \cap Y)$.*

Moreover, if $Y \in d$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$, then for each pair of disjoint sets $U' \in \tau_2'$, $V' \in \tau_1'$, there is a pair of disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $U \cap Y = U'$ and $V \cap Y = V'$.

Proof. Since $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$, it is obvious that for $Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ we have $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U = \tau_1(U \cap Y)$ for any set $U \in \tau_2$.

If $Y \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, $U \in \tau_1$ and $x \in \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U$, then for each $U(x) \in \tau_2$ we have $U(x) \cap U \in \tau_2 \setminus \varnothing$. Since $\tau_1 S \tau_2$, by (2) of Theorem 2.1.5 in [8], $\tau_1 \operatorname{int}(U(x) \cap U) \neq \varnothing$ and so $\tau_1 \operatorname{int}\big(U(x) \cap U\big) \cap Y \neq \varnothing$ as $Y \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$. Hence, $U(x) \cap (U \cap Y) \neq \varnothing$ and thus, $x \in \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(U \cap Y)$ so that $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(U \cap Y)$ for any $U \in \tau_1$.

Now, let $U' \in \tau_2'$, $V' \in \tau_1'$ and $U' \cap V' = \varnothing$. Let $U'' \in \tau_2$, $V'' \in \tau_1$ and $U'' \cap Y = U'$, $V'' \cap Y = V'$. By the first part,

$$\begin{aligned} \varnothing = U' \cap \tau_2' \operatorname{cl} V' &= U' \cap (\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V' \cap Y) = \\ &= U' \cap (\tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(V'' \cap Y) \cap Y) = U' \cap (\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V'' \cap Y) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, $\varnothing = V' \cap (\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U'' \cap Y)$. Let $U = U'' \setminus \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V''$ and $V = V'' \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U''$. Then $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$, $U \cap V = \varnothing$ and $U \cap Y = U'$, $V \cap Y' = V'$. □

Note also here, that if $\varnothing \neq A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(X)$ in $(X, \tau_1 <_S \tau_2)$ and $Y \in j\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, then A is i-concentrated on Y. Indeed, let $A = \tau_i \operatorname{cl} \tau_j \operatorname{int} A \neq \varnothing$. Then $\tau_j \operatorname{int} A \neq \varnothing$ and since $Y \in j\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, by Lemma 2.16, $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} \tau_j \operatorname{int} A = \tau_i \operatorname{cl}\big(\tau_j \operatorname{int} A \cap Y\big)$, i.e., $A = \tau_i \operatorname{cl}(\tau_j \operatorname{int} A \cap Y)$. Hence

$$A \subset \tau_i \operatorname{cl}\big(\tau_i \operatorname{cl} \tau_j \operatorname{int} A \cap Y\big) = \tau_i \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y).$$

Definition 2.17. A BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (d,p)-densely normal if there is a BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') of X such that $Y \in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ and X is p-normal on Y.

Following [22], a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-middly normal if for every pair of disjoint sets $A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(X)$ and $B \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(X)$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$.

Proposition 2.18. *Every (d,p)-densely normal* BS $(X, \tau_1 <_S \tau_2)$ *is p-middly normal.*

Proof. Let $A = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} \tau_2 \operatorname{int} A$, $B = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} \tau_1 \operatorname{int} B$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Following condition, there is a subset $Y \in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ such that X is p-normal on Y. By the remark before Definition 2.17, $A \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$ and $B \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y)$, i.e., A and B are respectively 1- and 2-concentrated on Y. Since X is p-normal on Y, there are $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$. □

Remark 2.19. If $Y \in i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$ in a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) and $F \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i'$ in (Y, τ_1', τ_2'), then $F \in i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$. Indeed, let $Y = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} \Phi_k$, where $\Phi_k \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i$.

Since $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$, there is $T \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ such that $T \cap Y = F$. Hence $F = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} (\Phi_k \cap T) \in i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$.

Lemma 2.20. *Let A_1, A_2 are subsets of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *and there are countable families $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_1 = \{U_k^1\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \tau_1$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_2 = \{U_k^2\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \tau_2$ such that*

$$A_1 \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k^1, \quad A_2 \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k^2,$$

$$A_1 \cap \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U_k^2 = \varnothing \ \text{ and } \ A_2 \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_k^1 = \varnothing, \ \text{ for each } \ k = \overline{1, \infty}. \qquad (*)$$

Then there are $U_1 \in \tau_1$, $U_2 \in \tau_2$ such that $A_i \subset U_i$ and $U_1 \cap U_2 = \varnothing$.

Proof. Let $V_1^1 = U_1^1$, $V_k^1 = U_k^1 \setminus \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{k-1} \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U_n^2$, $k = \overline{2, \infty}$ and

$$V_k^2 = U_k^2 \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{k} \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_n^1, \quad k = \overline{1, \infty}.$$

The sets V_k^1 and V_k^2 are respectively 1-open and 2-open for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$. Hence $U_1 = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} V_k^1 \in \tau_1$, $U_2 = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} V_k^2 \in \tau_2$ and by $(*)$, we have $A_1 \subset U_1$ and $A_2 \subset U_2$.

Finally, by construction, if $\ell \geq k$, then

$$\begin{aligned} V_k^1 \cap V_\ell^2 &= \big(U_k^1 \setminus \big(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U_1^2 \cup \dots \cup \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U_{k-1}^2\big)\big) \cap \\ &\cap \big(U_\ell^2 \setminus \big(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_1^1 \cup \dots \cup \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_k^1 \cup \dots \cup \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_\ell^1\big)\big) \subset \\ &\subset U_k^1 \cap (U_\ell^2 \setminus U_k^1) = \varnothing, \end{aligned}$$

and if $\ell < k$, then

$$\begin{aligned} V_k^1 \cap V_\ell^2 &= \big(U_k^1 \setminus \big(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U_1^2 \cup \dots \cup \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U_\ell^2 \cup \dots \cup \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U_{k-1}^2\big)\big) \cap \\ &\cap \big(U_\ell^2 \setminus \big(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_1^1 \cup \dots \cup \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_\ell^1\big)\big) \subset \\ &\subset (U_k^1 \setminus U_\ell^2) \cap U_\ell^2 = \varnothing. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $V_k^1 \cap V_\ell^2 = \varnothing$ for each k and ℓ and so $U_1 \cap U_2 = \varnothing$. ☐

Lemma 2.21. *If (X, τ_1, τ_2) is a p-normal* BS, *$P \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$, $Q \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$ and $(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} P \cap Q) \cup (P \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Q) = \varnothing$, then there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $P \subset U$ and $Q \subset V$.*

Proof. Let $P = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k$, where $F_k \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$. By condition, $P \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Q = \varnothing$ and so, $F_k \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Q = \varnothing$ for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$. Since (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-normal, by (4) of Definition 1.1, for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$

there is $U_k^2 \in \tau_2$ such that $F_k \subset U_k^2$ and $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U_k^2 \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Q = \varnothing$. It is obvious that $P \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k^2$. Similarly, one can construct a countable family $\{U_k^1\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \tau_1$ such that $Q \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k^1$ and $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_k^1 \cap \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} P = \varnothing$ for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$. Hence, by Lemma 2.20, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $P \subset U$ and $Q \subset V$. $\square$

Proposition 2.22. *If $Y \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X) \cap 2\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$ and (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-normal, then (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is p-strongly normal in X.*

Proof. Let $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2'$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then

$$(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap B) \cup (A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B) = \varnothing.$$

Moreover, by Remark 2.19, $A \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$ and $B \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$. Hence, by Lemma 2.21, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$. $\square$

Let us show, that if $\tau_i \subset j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$ in a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), then for any BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') we have $\tau_i' \subset j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y)$. Indeed, let $U' \in \tau_i'$. Then there is $U \in \tau_i$ such that

$$U' = U \cap Y = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k \cap Y = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} (F_k \cap Y),$$

where $F_k \cap Y \in \operatorname{co} \tau_j'$ for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$, and so $\tau_i' \subset j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y)$. Hence, take place

Proposition 2.23. *Every* BsS *of an (i,j)-perfectly normal* BS *is (i,j)-perfectly normal, where by* [16], *(X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i,j)-perfectly normal if it is p-normal and $\tau_i \subset j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$.*

The reasonings below we come to the new type of bitopological separation axioms.

A double family is a pair of families $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2\}$, where $\mathcal{A}_i \subset 2^X$.

Definition 2.24. In a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) a double family $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2\}$ is said to be $d \wedge p$-discrete if each point $x \in X$ has as a neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_1$ so a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_2$ each of which intersects at most one set from $\mathcal{A}$. A double family $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2\}$ is $\mathrm{W}\,p$-discrete if each point $x \in X$ has a neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_1$ that intersects at most one set of $\mathcal{A}_2$ or has a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_2$ that intersects at most one set of $\mathcal{A}_1$.

It is obvious that if $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2\}$, is $d \wedge p$-discrete, then $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are discrete in the usual sense and $\mathcal{A}$ is $d \wedge p$-disjoint, that is, if $A_1 \in \mathcal{A}_i$, $A_2 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$ and $A_1 \neq A_2$, then $A_1 \cap A_2 = \varnothing$.

Definition 2.25. A family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} = \{F_s\}_{s\in S}$ ($\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{U_s\}_{s\in S}$) of subsets of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is said to be p-closed (p-open) if $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cup \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ ($\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \subset \tau_1 \cup \tau_2$) and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} \cap \big(\operatorname{co}\tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}\big) \neq \varnothing$ ($\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \cap \big(\tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}\big) \neq \varnothing$).

Hence, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} = \{F_s\}_{s\in S}$ ($\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{U_s\}_{s\in S}$) is a double family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_2\}$ ($\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_2\}$), where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_1 = \{F_s\}_{s\in S_1} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_2 = \{F_s\}_{s\in S_2} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ $\big(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_1 = \{U_s\}_{s\in S_1} \subset \tau_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_2 = \{U_s\}_{s\in S_2} \subset \tau_2\big)$ and $S_1 \cup S_2 = S$.

Definition 2.26. A BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is said to be p-collectionwise normal if it is R-p-T$_1$ and for every p-closed $d \wedge p$-discrete family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_2\}$, where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_i = \{F_s\}_{s\in S_i} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, there exists a p-open $d \wedge p$-disjoint family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_2\}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_i = \{U_s\}_{s\in S_j} \subset \tau_i$ and $F_s \subset U_s$ for each $s \in S$.

Clearly, every p-collectionwise normal BS is p-normal.

Theorem 2.27. *In a p-collectionwise normal* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *for any p-closed $d \wedge p$-discrete family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_2\}$, where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_i = \{F_s\}_{s\in S_i} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, there exists a p-open* W *p-discrete family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_2\}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_i = \{V_s\}_{s\in S_j} \subset \tau_i$ and $F_s \subset V_s$ for each $s \in S$.*

Proof. We have $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_2\}$, where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_1 = \{F_s\}_{s\in S_1} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_2 = \{F_s\}_{s\in S_2} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, and by Definition 2.24, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_1$ is 1-discrete, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_2$ is 2-discrete. By Definition 2.26, there exists a p-open $d\wedge p$-disjoint family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_2\}$, where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_i = \{U_s\}_{s\in S_j} \subset \tau_i$ and $F_s \subset U_s$ for each $s \in S$. Following Theorem 1.1.11 in [10],

$$F_1 = \bigcup_{s\in S_1} F_s \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1, \quad F_2 = \bigcup_{s\in S_2} F_s \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$$

and since (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-normal,

$$F_1 \cap \Phi_2 = \varnothing = F_2 \cap \Phi_1, \ \text{ where } \ \Phi_i = \Big(X \setminus \bigcup_{s\in S_j} U_s\Big) \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i,$$

there are neighborhoods $U(\Phi_i) \in \tau_j$ such that

$$F_1 \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U(\Phi_2) = \varnothing = F_2 \cap \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U(\Phi_1).$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_2\}$, where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_i = \big\{V_s = U_s \setminus \tau_i \operatorname{cl} U(\Phi_i) : \ s \in S_j\big\}$. Then, it is clear that $F_s \subset V_s$ for each $s \in S$ and $\Phi_i \cup \big(\bigcup_{s\in S_j} U_s\big) = X$.

It remains to prove only, that the p-open $d \wedge p$-disjoint family

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_2\} = \\ = \Big\{\big\{V_s = U_s \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U(\Phi_1) : \ s \in S_2\big\}, \big\{V_s = U_s \setminus \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U(\Phi_2) : \ s \in S_1\big\}\Big\}$$

is W p-discrete.

Indeed, let, first, $x \in \Phi_i$. Then $x \in U(\Phi_i) \in \tau_j$ and $U(\Phi_i) \cap V_s = \varnothing$ for each $s \in S_j$. If $x \in \bigcup\limits_{s \in S_j} U_s$, then $x \in U_{s_0} \in \tau_i$ for some $s_0 \in S_j$. Since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_2\}$ is $d \wedge p$-disjoint, we have $U_{s_0} \cap U_s = \varnothing$ for each $s \in S_i$ and by determination of the double family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_2\}$, $U_{s_0} \cap V_s = \varnothing$ for each $s \in S_i$.

Thus, by Definition 2.24, the p-open family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_1, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}_2\}$ is W p-discrete. □

Definition 2.28. A BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is said to be (i, j)-separately normal if for each pair of disjoint sets A, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ there are disjoint sets U, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset U$.

It is evident that every p-collectionwise normal BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-separately normal.

Proposition 2.29. *A* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* (i, j)*-separately normal if and only if for every set* $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ *and every neighborhood* $U(A) \in \tau_i$ *there is a neighborhood* $V(A) \in \tau_j$ *such that* $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(A) \subset U(A)$.

Proof. Let, first, X be (i, j)-separately normal, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $U(A) \in \tau_i$. Then $A \cap B = \varnothing$, where $B = X \setminus U(A) \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and so, there are $V(A)$, $V(B) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(A) \cap V(B) = \varnothing$. Hence

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(A) \subset X \setminus V(B) \subset X \setminus B = U(A).$$

Conversely, let the condition is satisfied, A, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then $A \subset X \setminus B = U(A) \in \tau_i$ and hence, there is $V(A) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(A) \subset U(A) = X \setminus B$ and thus, $B \subset X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(A) = V(B) \in \tau_j$. Clearly, $V(A) \cap V(B) = \varnothing$. □

For a BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ take place the following implications:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \text{ is } (2,1)\text{-separately normal} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & X \text{ is 2-normal} \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
X \text{ is 1-normal} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & X \text{ is } (1,2)\text{-separately normal} \\
 & X \text{ is } p\text{-normal} \arrow[u, Rightarrow]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Moreover, by (4) of Corollary 2.2.8 in [8], for a BS $(X, \tau_1 <_C \tau_2)$ we have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & X \text{ is } (2,1)\text{-sep. normal} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & X \text{ is 2-normal} \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
X \text{ is } p\text{-normal} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & X \text{ is 1-normal} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & X \text{ is } (1,2)\text{-sep. normal,}
\end{tikzcd}$$

and by (4) of Corollary 2.3.13 in [8], for a BS $(X,\tau_1<_N\tau_2)$ we have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \text{ is } (2,1)\text{-separately normal} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & X \text{ is } 2\text{-normal} \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
X \text{ is } 1\text{-normal} \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & X \text{ is } p\text{-normal} \arrow[l, Leftrightarrow] \\
X \text{ is } (1,2)\text{-separately normal.} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Definition 2.30. Let (Y,τ_1',τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2). Then

(1) Y is (i,j)-quasi separately normal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets A, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$ there are disjoint sets U, $V\in\tau_j'$ such that $A\cap Y\subset U$ and $B\cap Y\subset V$.

(2) Y is (i,j)-separately normal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets A, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$ there are disjoint sets U, $V\in\tau_j$ such that $A\cap Y\subset U$ and $B\cap Y\subset V$.

(3) Y is (i,j)-strongly separately normal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets A, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ there are disjoint sets U, $V\in\tau_j$ such that $A\subset U$ and $B\subset V$.

(4) Y is (i,j)-separately supernormal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$ there are disjoint sets $U,V\in\tau_j$, such that $A\subset U$ and $B\subset V$.

(5) Y is (i,j)-WS-separately normal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$ there are disjoint sets $U\in\tau_j'$, $V\in\tau_j$ such that $A\subset U$ and $B\cap Y\subset V$.

(6) Y is (i,j)-WS-separately supernormal in X if for each pair of disjoint sets $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$ there are disjoint sets $U\in\tau_j'$, $V\in\tau_j$ such that $A\subset U$ and $B\subset V$.

It is clear that if (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2), then

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-sep. norm.} \arrow[d, Rightarrow, "Y\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i"'] & \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-sep. supernorm. in } X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-strong. sep. norm. in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-WS-sep. supernorm. in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-sep. norm. in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-WS-sep. norm. in } X & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-quasi sep. norm. in } X.
\end{tikzcd}$$

By analogy with Proposition 2.9 one can prove

Proposition 2.31. *Let* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). *Then*

1. Y *is* (i, j)*-strongly separately normal in* X *if and only if for each set* $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ *and any neighborhood* $U'(F) \in \tau_i'$ *there is a neighborhood* $U(F) \in \tau_j$ *such that* $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(F) \cap Y \subset U'(F)$.
2. Y *is* (i, j)-WS*-separately supernormal in* X *if and only if for each set* $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ *and any neighborhood* $U(F) \in \tau_i$ *there is a neighborhood* $V'(F) \in \tau_j'$ *such that* $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(F) \subset U(F)$.
3. Y *is* (i, j)*-separately supernormal in* X *if and only if for each set* $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ *and any neighborhood* $U(F) \in \tau_i$ *there is a neighborhood* $U(F) \in \tau_j$ *such that* $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$.

Definition 2.32. A BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i, j)-separately regular if for each point $x \in X$ and each set $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, $x \overline{\in} F$, there are disjoint sets $U, V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \subset V$.

Proposition 2.33. *A* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* (i, j)*-separately regular if and only if for each point* $x \in X$ *and any neighborhood* $U(x) \in \tau_i$ *there is a neighborhood* $V(x) \in \tau_j$ *such that* $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$.

The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 2.29.

Clearly, if (X, τ_1, τ_2) is i-T_1, then (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i, j)-separately normal implies that (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i, j)-separately regular.

Take place the following simple but important

Theorem 2.34. *If a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is p-separately regular, then* (X, τ_1) *is Baire if and only if* (X, τ_2) *is Baire.*

Proof. If (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-separately regular, then it follows immediately from Proposition 2.33 and (1) of Theorem 2.1.5 in [8] that $\tau_1 S \tau_2$. Hence, it remains to use Proposition 3.4 in [25]. □

Therefore, all results from [8] and [25], which are connected with S-related topologies, are also correct for p-separately regular bitopological spaces.

Below we give the relative versions of bitopological separate regularity.

Definition 2.35. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then

1. Y is (i, j)-WS-quasi separately regular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \overline{\in} F$, there are disjoint sets $U, V \in \tau_j'$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \cap Y \subset V$.

(2) Y is (i,j)-separately regular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \,\overline{\in}\, F$ there are disjoint sets U, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \cap Y \subset V$.
(3) Y is (i,j)-strongly separately regular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_i$ and $x \,\overline{\in}\, F$ there are disjoint sets U, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \subset V$.
(4) Y is (i,j)-separately superregular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \,\overline{\in}\, F$ there are disjoint sets U, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \subset V$.
(5) Y is (i,j)-WS-separately regular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \,\overline{\in}\, F$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau'_j$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \cap Y \subset V$.
(6) Y is (i,j)-WS-separately superregular in X if for $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \,\overline{\in}\, F$ there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau'_j$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \subset V$.
(7) Y is (i,j)-free separately regular in X if for $x \in X$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \,\overline{\in}\, F$ there are disjoint sets U, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$ and $F \cap Y \subset V$.

It is evident that if (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), then the following implications hold:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-sep. reg.} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-free sep. reg. in } X \arrow[dd, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-sep. superreg. in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \arrow[dr, Rightarrow] & \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-WS-sep. superreg. in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-strong. sep. reg. in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-WS-sep. reg. in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-sep. reg. in } X \arrow[l, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } (i,j)\text{-WS-quasi sep. reg. in } X &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Take place

Proposition 2.36. *Let* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). *Then*

(1) *Y is (i,j)-strongly separately regular in X if and only if for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U'(x) \in \tau'_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \cap Y \subset U'(x)$.*

(2) *Y is (i,j)-WS-separately superregular in X if and only if for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V'(x) \in \tau'_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U(x)$.*

(3) *Y is (i,j)-separately superregular in X if and only if for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$.*

The proof is analogical to the proof of Proposition 2.3 and can be omitted.

Corollary 2.37. *A TsS (Y,τ') of a TS (X,τ) is strongly separately regular (respectively, WS-separately superregular, separately superregular) in X if and only if for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U'(x) \in \tau'$ (respectively, $U(x) \in \tau$) there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau$ (respectively, $V'(x) \in \tau'$, $V(x) \in \tau$) such that $\tau \operatorname{cl} V(x) \cap Y \subset U'(x)$ (respectively, $\tau \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U(x)$, $\tau \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(X)$).*

Hence, it follows immediately from the remark before Definition 2.4 and Corollary 2.37 that if (Y,τ') is a TsS of a TS, then Y is strongly regular (respectively, WS-superregular, superregular) in X if and only if Y is strongly separately regular (respectively, WS-separately superregular, separately superregular) in X.

At the end of the section let us consider the bitopological and topological versions of relative extremal disconnectedness and relative connectedness.

Proposition 2.38. *A BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) is p-connected if and only if for each $A \subset X$, $\varnothing \neq A \neq X$, we have $(1,2)$-$\operatorname{Fr} A \neq \varnothing \neq (2,1)$-$\operatorname{Fr} A$.*

Proof. Clearly, $(1,2)$-$\operatorname{Fr} A = \varnothing$ if and only if $A \in \tau_2 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $(2,1)$-$\operatorname{Fr} A = \varnothing$ if and only if $A \in \tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$. Hence, it remains to use (7) of Definition 1.1. □

Definition 2.39. A BsS (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) is (i,j)-extremally disconnected in X if $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U' \in \tau_i$ for each set $U' \in \tau'_i$.

Clearly, if $Y \in \tau_i$ and X is (i,j)-extremally disconnected, then Y is (i,j)-extremally disconnected in X and so, by reasonings after Definition 0.1.18 in [8], if $Y \in \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$, then the following three conditions are equivalent: Y is $(1,2)$-extremally disconnected in X, Y is $(2,1)$-extremally disconnected in X and Y is p-extremally disconnected in X.

Definition 2.40. A TsS (Y,τ') of a TS (X,τ) is extremally disconnected in X if $\tau \operatorname{cl} U' \in \tau$ for each set $U' \in \tau'$.

Clearly, if X is extremally disconnected and $Y \in \tau$, then Y is extremally disconnected in X.

Proposition 2.41. *If* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is a* $(1,2)$*-extremally disconnected or* $(2,1)$*-extremally disconnected* BsS *of a* p*-connected* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2)*, then* Y *is* p*-connected too.*

Proof. Contrary: Y is not p-connected. Then $Y = A \cup B$, where $A \in (\tau'_1 \cap \operatorname{co} \tau'_2) \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $B \in (\tau'_2 \cap \operatorname{co} \tau'_1) \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Let, for example, Y is $(2,1)$-extremally disconnected in X. Then $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} B \in \tau_2$, $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} B \neq X$ as $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} B \cap A = \varnothing$ and so, by (7) of Definition 1.1, X is not p-connected. □

Corollary 2.42. *If* (Y, τ') *is an extremally disconnected* TsS *of a connected* TS X*, then* Y *is connected too.*

However, we have the following elementary

Example 2.43. Let $X = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$, $\tau = \big\{\varnothing, \{a\}, \{a, b\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{d, e\}, \{a, d, e\}, \{a, b, d, e\}, X\big\}$ and $Y = \{a, b, c\}$. Then $\tau' = \big\{\varnothing, \{a\}, \{a, b\}, Y\big\}$, (Y, τ') is connected, Y is extremally disconnected in X and X is disconnected.

Proposition 2.44. *If* (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is a* p*-connected* p*-Tychonoff* BS *which contains more than one point, then* $|X| \geq \mathbf{c}$*, where* $\mathbf{c}$ *is the cardinality of* $\mathbb{R}$*.*

Proof. Let X be a p-Tychonoff BS, x_1, $x_2 \in X$, $x_1 \neq x_2$. Since X is R-p-T_1, by (3) of Definition 1.1 and Proposition 0.1.4 in [8], there is a d-continuous function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega'_1, \omega'_2)$ such that $f(x_1) = 0$ and $f(x_2) = 1$. Since X is p-connected, by (7) of Definition 1.1, the function f has the Darboux property and hence, $I \subset f(X)$. Thus $|X| \geq \mathbf{c}$. □

Definition 2.45. A BsS (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-connected in X if for each set $A \subset X$, $\varnothing \neq A \neq X$, we have $(1,2)$-$\operatorname{Fr} A \cap Y \neq \varnothing \neq (2,1)$-$\operatorname{Fr} A \cap Y$.

Proposition 2.46. *If* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *and* Y *is* p*-connected in* X*, then* X *is* p*-connected. Moreover, if* $Y \in \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$*, then* Y *is* p*-connected too.*

Proof. The first part follows directly from Definition 2.45 and Proposition 2.38. Now, let $Y \in \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$ and $A \subset Y$, $\varnothing \neq A \neq Y$. Then $\varnothing \neq A \neq X$ and since $Y \in \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$, (i,j)-$\operatorname{Fr} A \cap Y = (i,j)$-$\operatorname{Fr}_Y A$. Thus, it remains to apply once more Proposition 2.38. □

Corollary 2.47. *If* (Y, τ') *is a connected* TsS *of a* TS (X, τ)*, i.e., if* $\varnothing \neq A \neq X$ *implies that* $\operatorname{Fr} A \cap Y \neq \varnothing$*, then* X *is connected. Moreover, if* $Y \in \tau$*, then* Y *is connected too.*

3. (i,j)-Relative Regularities

From Definition 2.2 it follows immediately

Proposition 3.1. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'')\subset(Y,\tau_1',\tau_2')\subset(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$*, then*

(1) *If* Y *is* (i,j)*-quasi regular (respectively,* (i,j)*-regular,* (i,j)*-strongly regular,* (i,j)*-superregular,* (i,j)-WS*-regular,* (i,j)-WS*-superregular,* (i,j)*-free regular) in* X*, then* Z *is also* (i,j)*-quasi regular (respectively,* (i,j)*-regular,* (i,j)*-strongly regular,* (i,j)*-superregular,* (i,j)-WS*-regular,* (i,j)-WS*-superregular,* (i,j)*-free regular) in* X.

(2) *If* Z *is* (i,j)*-quasi regular (respectively,* (i,j)*-regular,* (i,j)*-strongly regular,* (i,j)*-superregular,* (i,j)-WS*-regular,* (i,j)-WS*-superregular,* (i,j)*-free regular) in* X*, then* Z *is also* (i,j)*-quasi regular (respectively,* (i,j)*-regular,* (i,j)*-strongly regular,* (i,j)*-superregular,* (i,j)-WS*-regular,* (i,j)-WS*-superregular,* (i,j)*-free regular) in* Y.

Proposition 3.2. *If* $(Y,\tau_1'<\tau_2')$ *is a* j*-dense* BsS *of a* BS $(X,\tau_1<_S\tau_2)$*, then* Y *is* (i,j)*-regular if and only if* Y *is* (i,j)*-regular in* X.

Proof. Let, first, Y be (i,j)-regular in X, $x\in Y$, $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ and $x\overline{\in}F$. Since $x\overline{\in}\tau_i\operatorname{cl}F\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$, there are disjoint sets $U\in\tau_i$, $V\in\tau_j$ such that $x\in U$, $\tau_i\operatorname{cl}F\cap Y=F\subset V$. It is clear, that $x\in U'=U\cap Y\in\tau_i'$, $F\subset V'=V\cap Y\in\tau_j'$ and so Y is (i,j)-regular.

Conversely, let Y be (i,j)-regular, $x\in Y$, $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x\overline{\in}F$. Then there are disjoint sets $U''\in\tau_i'$, $V'\in\tau_j'$ such that $x\in U''$ and $F\cap Y\subset V'$. Clearly $U''\cap\tau_i'\operatorname{cl}V'=\varnothing$. Let $U'\in\tau_i$, $V\in\tau_j$ such that $U'\cap Y=U''$ and $V\cap Y=V'$. Then, by Lemma 2.16,

$$\begin{aligned}\varnothing&=U'\cap\tau_i'\operatorname{cl}V'=U'\cap\tau_i'\operatorname{cl}(V\cap Y)=U'\cap\big(\tau_i\operatorname{cl}(V\cap Y)\cap Y\big)=\\&=U'\cap(\tau_i\operatorname{cl}V\cap Y).\end{aligned}$$

Let $U=U'\backslash\tau_i\operatorname{cl}V=U'\backslash(\tau_i\operatorname{cl}V\backslash Y)$. Then $x\in U\in\tau_i$, $F\cap Y\subset V'\subset V$ and $U\cap V=\varnothing$. Thus Y is (i,j)-regular in X. □

Corollary 3.3. *If* $(Y,\tau_1'<\tau_2')$ *is a* 2*-dense* BsS *of a* BS $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$*, then* Y *is* $(1,2)$*-regular if and only if* Y *is* $(1,2)$*-regular in* X.

Proof. Indeed, it suffices to note that by the first part of Lemma 2.16, $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U=\tau_1\operatorname{cl}(U\cap Y)$ for any set $U\in\tau_2$. □

Proposition 3.4. *If* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is an* (i,j)*-superregular* BsS *in a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), A *is an* i*-compact subset of* Y, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_i$ *and* $A \cap B = \varnothing$, *then there are disjoint sets* $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ *such that* $A \subset U$ *and* $B \subset V$.

Proof. Since $A, B \subset Y$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$, we have $A \cap \tau_i \operatorname{cl} B = \varnothing$. Moreover, as Y is (i,j)-superregular in X, for each point $x \in A$ there are disjoint sets $U(x) \in \tau_i$ and $U_x(\tau_i \operatorname{cl} B) \in \tau_j$. Since $A \subset \bigcup\limits_{x \in A} (U(x) \cap Y)$ and A is i-compact in Y, there are $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in A$ such that $A \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{n} \big(U(x_k) \cap Y\big)$. Finally, if $U = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{n} U(x_k)$ and $V = \bigcap\limits_{k=1}^{n} U_{x_k}(\tau_i \operatorname{cl} B)$, then $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$, $A \subset U$, $B \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. ☐

Corollary 3.5. *If* (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* (i,j)*-regular,* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is a* BsS *of* X, A *is* i*-compact in* Y, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_i$ *and* $A \cap B = \varnothing$, *then there are disjoint sets* $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ *such that* $A \subset U$ *and* $B \subset V$.

Proof. The condition is obvious since Y is (i,j)-superregular in X. ☐

Proposition 3.6. *A* BsS (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* (i,j)*-regular in a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *if and only if for each point* $x \in Y$ *and each set* $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_i$, $x \overline{\in} F$, *there is a set* $U \in \tau_i$ *such that* $x \in U$ *and* $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U \cap F = \varnothing$.

Proof. Let, first, Y be (i,j)-regular in X, $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_i$ and $x \overline{\in} F$. Then $x \overline{\in} \tau_i \operatorname{cl} F$ and hence, there are $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $x \in U$, $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} F \cap Y = F \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. Clearly,

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U \cap V = \varnothing \ \text{ and so } \ \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U \cap F = \varnothing.$$

Conversely, let the condition be satisfied, $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \overline{\in} F$. Then $x \overline{\in} F \cap Y = F' \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_i$ and by condition, there is $U \in \tau_i$ such that $x \in U$ and $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U \cap F' = \varnothing$. Let $V = X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U$. Then $V \in \tau_j$, $F' \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. Thus Y is (i,j)-regular in X. ☐

Proposition 3.7. *If* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* (i,j)-WS*-superregular in* X *and* (i,j)*-extremally disconnected in* X, *then* (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}_x X = 0$ *for each point* $x \in Y$.

Proof. Let $x \in Y$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Since Y is (i,j)-WS-superregular in X, by (2) of Proposition 2.3 there is $V'(x) \in \tau'_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U(x)$. But Y is (i,j)-extremally disconnected in X and hence, $V(x) = \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \in \tau_i$. Thus $V(x) \in \tau_i \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ and so (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}_x X = 0$. ☐

Corollary 3.8. *If* (Y, τ') *is* WS*-superregular in* X *and extremally disconnected in* X, *then* $\operatorname{ind}_x X = 0$ *for each point* $x \in Y$.

4. (i,j)-Relative Normalities

Proposition 4.1. *Let* $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'')\subset(Y,\tau_1',\tau_2')\subset(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$. *Then*

(1) Y *is p-normal implies that* Z *is p-quasi normal in* X, *and* Y *is p-normal in* X *implies that* Z *is p-normal in* X *too.*

(2) *If* $Y\in\tau_1\cup\tau_2$, *then* Z *is p-strongly normal in* Y *implies that* Z *is p-strongly normal in* X.

(3) *If* $Y\in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, $\tau_1<_S\tau_2$ *and* Z *is p-internally normal in* Y, *then* Z *is p-internally normal in* X.

Let $(Y,\tau_1''',\tau_2''')\subset(Y_1,\tau_1'',\tau_2'')\subset(X_1,\tau_1',\tau_2')\subset(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$. *Then*

(4) Y_1 *is p-quasi normal in* X_1 *implies that* Y *is p-quasi normal in* X.

Proof. (1) Let, first, $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Then $A\cap Y\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B\cap Y\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ are disjoint and so, there are disjoint sets $U'\in\tau_2'$, $V'\in\tau_1'$ such that $A\cap Y\subset U'$ and $B\cap Y\subset V'$. It is evident that $A\cap Z\subset U\in\tau_2''$ and $B\cap Z\subset V\in\tau_1''$, where $U=U''\cap Z$, $V=V''\cap Z$ and $U''\cap Y=U'$, $V''\cap Y=V'$ for $U''\in\tau_2$, $V''\in\tau_1''$.

The second condition is obvious.

(2) Now, let $Y\in\tau_1\cup\tau_2$, $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1''$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2''$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Hence, by condition, there are disjoint $U'\in\tau_2'$, $V'\in\tau_1'$ such that $A\subset U'$ and $B\subset V'$. Let, for example, $Y\in\tau_1$. Then $V'\in\tau_1$ and if $U\in\tau_2$, $U\cap Y=U'$, then we have $A\subset U$, $B\subset V'$ and $U\cap V'=\varnothing$. Thus, Z is p-strongly normal in X.

(3) Let $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $A,B\subset Z$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Since $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and Z is p-internally normal in Y, there are disjoint sets $U''\in\tau_2'$, $V''\in\tau_1'$ such that $A\subset U''$ and $B\subset V''$.

Therefore, by the second part of Lemma 2.16 there are disjoint sets $U\in\tau_2$, $V\in\tau_1$ such that $A\subset U$ and $B\subset V$ so that Z is p-internally normal in X.

(4) Finally, let $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Then

$$A_1=A\cap X_1\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1',\quad B_1=B\cap X_1\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$$

and by condition, there are disjoint $U'\in\tau_2''$, $V'\in\tau_1''$ such that $A_1\cap Y_1\subset U'$ and $B_1\cap Y_1\subset V'$. It is clear, that

$$A\cap Y=(A_1\cap Y_1)\cap Y\subset U\in\tau_2',$$
$$B\cap Y=(B_1\cap Y_1)\cap Y\subset V\in\tau_1',$$

where $U=U'\cap Y$ and $V=V'\cap Y$. Thus Y is p-quasi normal in X. □

Our next purpose is to establish the conditions under which the converse implications to the implications after Definition 2.11 hold.

Lemma 4.2. *If in a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *for every pair of disjoint sets* $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2$ *and every pair of sets* $U\in\tau_2$, $V\in\tau_1$, *where* $A\subset U$ *and* $B\subset V$, *there are sequences* $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}\subset\tau_2$, $\{V_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}\subset\tau_1$ *such that*

$$A\subset\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty}U_n,\quad B\subset\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty}V_n,\quad \tau_1\operatorname{cl}U_n\subset U\ \ \textit{and}\ \ \tau_2\operatorname{cl}V_n\subset V$$

for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$, *then* X *is* p*-normal.*

Proof. Let $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. If $U=X\setminus B\in\tau_2$ and $V=X\setminus A\in\tau_1$, then $A\subset U$, $B\subset V$ and, by condition, there are sequences $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}\subset\tau_2$, $\{V_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}\subset\tau_1$ such that

$$A\subset\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty}U_n\ \text{ and }\ B\cap\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U_n=\varnothing,\ \text{ for each }\ n=\overline{1,\infty},$$

and

$$B\subset\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty}V_n\ \text{ and }\ A\cap\tau_2\operatorname{cl}V_n=\varnothing,\ \text{ for each }\ n=\overline{1,\infty}. \tag{$*$}$$

Let us consider for each $k=\overline{1,\infty}$ the sets:

$$G_k=U_k\setminus\bigcup_{\ell\le k}\tau_2\operatorname{cl}V_\ell,\quad H_k=V_k\setminus\bigcup_{\ell\le k}\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U_\ell. \tag{$**$}$$

Then $G_k\in\tau_2$, $H_k\in\tau_1$ for each $k=\overline{1,\infty}$. Moreover, by $(*)$,

$$A\subset\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty}G_k=G\ \text{ and }\ B\subset\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty}H_k=H.$$

By $(**)$, $G_k\cap V_\ell=\varnothing$ for $\ell\le k$ and, hence, $G_k\cap H_\ell=\varnothing$ for $\ell\le k$. Similarly, $H_\ell\cap U_k=\varnothing$ for $k\le\ell$ and so $H_\ell\cap G_k=\varnothing$ for $k\le\ell$. Thus $G_k\cap H_\ell=\varnothing$ for each $k=\overline{1,\infty}$, $\ell=\overline{1,\infty}$ and, hence, $G\cap H=\varnothing$. Since $A\subset G$ and $B\subset H$, X is p-normal. □

Definition 4.3. We say that a BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is (i,j)-perfectly located in a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) if for each set $U\in\tau_j$, $Y\subset U$, there is a countable family $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}\subset\operatorname{co}\tau_i$ such that $Y\subset\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty}F_n\subset U$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let* (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *be a* p*-quasi normal* BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2). *Then the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *If* $Y\in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ *and* $\tau_1<_S\tau_2$, *then* Y *is* p*-normal in* X *and so* Y *is* p*-internally normal in* X.

(2) *If Y is p-perfectly located in X and $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} \tau_j \operatorname{cl} F \cap Y = F$ for each $F \in \operatorname{co} \tau'_j$, then Y is p-normal.*

Proof. (1) Let $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Since Y is p-quasi normal in X, there are disjoint sets $U'' \in \tau'_2$, $V'' \in \tau'_1$ such that $A \cap Y \subset U''$ and $B \cap Y \subset V''$. Therefore, by the second part of Lemma 2.16, there are $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$, $B \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. The rest is given by implications after Definition 2.11.

(2) Let $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau'_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau'_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Let us consider the sets

$$P = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} \big(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B\big) \text{ and } Q = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} \big(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B\big).$$

Then $U = X \setminus P \in \tau_1$ and $V = X \setminus Q \in \tau_2$. Moreover,

$$P \cap Y = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} \big(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B\big) \cap Y \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \cap Y = \\ = A \cap B = \varnothing$$

and similarly $Q \cap Y = \varnothing$. Hence, $Y \cap (P \cup Q) = \varnothing$ so that $Y \subset X \setminus (P \cup Q) = U \cap V$. Since Y is p-perfectly located in X, there are sequence $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \operatorname{co} \tau_1$ and $\{\Phi_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \operatorname{co} \tau_2$ such that $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n \subset V$ and $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \Phi_n \subset U$. Let

$$A_n = A \cap F_n = (A \cap Y) \cap F_n = A \cap (F_n \cap Y) \in \operatorname{co} \tau'_1, \\ B_n = B \cap \Phi_n = (B \cap Y) \cap \Phi_n = B \cap (\Phi_n \cap Y) \in \operatorname{co} \tau'_2$$

for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Then

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B_n = \\ = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap \Phi_n) \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \cap \Phi_n \subset P \cap U = \varnothing,$$

and similarly, $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \cap \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_n = \varnothing$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Since Y is p-quasi normal in X and $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B_n = \varnothing$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$, for the sets A and B_n there is a sequence $\{V_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \tau'_1$ such that $B_n \subset V_n$ and $A \cap \tau'_2 \operatorname{cl} V_n = \varnothing$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Similarly, since $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \cap \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_n = \varnothing$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$, for the sets B and A_n, there is a sequence $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \tau'_2$ such that $A_n \subset U_n$ and $B \cap \tau'_1 \operatorname{cl} U_n = \varnothing$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. It is also obvious that

$$A = A \cap \Big(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n\Big) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (A \cap F_n) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n, \\ B = B \cap \Big(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \Phi_n\Big) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (B \cap \Phi_n) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$$

and $A \subset \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n$, $B \subset \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} V_n$. Moreover, $\tau_2' \operatorname{cl} V_n \subset V = Y \setminus A$ and $\tau_1' \operatorname{cl} U_n \subset U = Y \setminus B$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Thus, by Lemma 4.2, (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is p-normal. $\square$

Corollary 4.5. *For a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *we have:*

1. *If $Y \in d$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$ and $\tau_1 <_S \tau_2$, then Y is p-quasi normal in X if and only if Y is p-normal in X.*
2. *If Y is p-perfectly located in X and $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} \tau_j \operatorname{cl} F \cap Y = F$ for each $F \in \operatorname{co} \tau_j'$, then Y is p-quasi normal in X if and only if Y is p-normal.*
3. *If $Y \in d$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$, $\tau_1 <_S \tau_2$ and Y is p-normal, then Y is p-internally normal in X.*

Proof. (1) and (2) follow respectively from (1) and (2) of Theorem 4.4 taking into account the implications after Definition 2.11.

(3) If Y is p-normal, then by implications after Definition 2.11, it is p-quasi normal in X. Hence, it remains to use (1) of Theorem 4.4. $\square$

Theorem 4.6. *A* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is p-strongly normal in X anyone of the following conditions is satisfied:*

1. $\big(Y \in d$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$, $\tau_1 <_S \tau_2$ *and Y is p-normal*$\big)$ *or* $\big(Y \in \tau_1 \cup \tau_2$ *and Y is p-normal*$\big)$.
2. $\big(Y \in p$-$\mathcal{C}l(X)$ *and Y is p-normal in X*$\big)$ *or* $\big(Y \in p$-$\mathcal{C}l(X)$ *and X is p-normal on Y*$\big)$.

Proof. (1) Let, first, $Y \in d$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$, $\tau_1 <_S \tau_2$ and Y is p-normal. If $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2'$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$, then there are disjoint $U'' \in \tau_2'$, $V'' \in \tau_1'$ such that $A \subset U''$ and $B \subset V''$.

Hence, by the second part of Lemma 2.16 there are $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$, $B \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$.

Now, let for example, $Y \in \tau_2$, $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2'$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then there are $U' \in \tau_2'$, $V' \in \tau_1'$ such that $A \subset U'$, $B \subset V'$ and $U' \cap V' = \varnothing$. Clearly, $U' \in \tau_2$ and if $V \in \tau_1$, $V \cap Y = V'$, then U' and V are the required disjoint respectively 2-open and 1-open neighborhoods of A and B.

(2) Let $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2'$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Since $Y = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y$ and $A, B \subset Y$, we have $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = \varnothing$. Hence, by condition, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y = A \subset U$ and $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \cap Y = B \subset V$.

Finally, if $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau'_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau'_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$, then $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = \varnothing$. Since

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \ \text{ and } \ \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \cap Y),$$

the sets $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A$ and $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B$ are respectively 1-concentrated and 2-concentrated on Y and since X is p-normal on Y, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \subset U$ and $B \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \subset V$. ☐

Corollary 4.7. *For a* BsS (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *we have:*

(1) *If* $Y \in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ *and* $\tau_1 <_S \tau_2$ *or if* $Y \in \tau_1 \cup \tau_2$, *then* Y *is* p*-normal if and only if* Y *is* p*-strongly normal in* X.
(2) *If* $Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$, *then* Y *is* p*-normal in* X *if and only if* Y *is* p*-strongly normal in* X.

Proof. (1) and (2) follow respectively from (1) and (2) of Theorem 4.6 taking into account the implications after Definition 2.11. ☐

Corollary 4.8. *If* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is a* BsS *of a* p*-normal* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *and* $Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$, *then* Y *is* p*-strongly normal in* X.

Proof. By implications after Definition 2.11, Y is p-normal in X and so it remains to use (2) of Corollary 4.7.

Corollary 4.7 is the reinforcement of Corollary 3.2.6 in [8]. ☐

The following simple statement is the reinforcement of the hereditarily p-normality.

Proposition 4.9. *Every* BsS (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *of a hereditarily* p*-normal* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* p*-strongly normal in* X.

Proof. Let $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau'_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau'_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then

$$(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap B) \cup (A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B) = \varnothing$$

and by (5) of Definition 1.1, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$. Thus Y is p-strongly normal in X. ☐

In counterpart to the fact that not every BsS of a p-normal BS is p-normal, we have the following simple

Proposition 4.10. *A* p*-normal* BS *is* p*-normal on its arbitrary* BsS.

Theorem 4.11. *If a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* p*-normal on a* BsS (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2), *then*

(1) Y *is* p*-normal in* X *and so,* Y *is* p*-internally normal in* X.
(2) $Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$ *implies that* Y *is* p*-middly normal.*

Proof. (1) Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Clearly,

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A = A, \quad \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y) \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = B, \text{ and}$$

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}\big(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap Y\big) \text{ since } A \cap Y \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap Y,$$
$$\tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y) \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}\big(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y) \cap Y\big) \text{ since } B \cap Y \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y) \cap Y.$$

Hence $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$ is 1-concentrated on Y, $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y)$ is 2-concentrated on Y and $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y) = \varnothing$. Since X is p-normal on Y, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that

$$A \cap Y \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \subset U, \quad B \cap Y \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y) \subset V.$$

Thus Y is p-normal in X. The rest follows from implications after Definition 2.11.

(2) Let

$$A' = \tau_1' \operatorname{cl} \tau_2' \operatorname{int} A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(Y), \quad B' = \tau_2' \operatorname{cl} \tau_1' \operatorname{int} B \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(Y)$$

in $Y = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y$ and $A' \cap B' = \varnothing$. Let us consider the disjoint sets $A = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} \tau_2' \operatorname{int} A'$ and $B = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} \tau_1' \operatorname{int} B'$. Since $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $A = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} \tau_2' \operatorname{int} A'$ for the set $\tau_2' \operatorname{int} A' \subset Y$ and $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $B = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} \tau_1' \operatorname{int} B'$ for the set $\tau_1' \operatorname{int} B' \subset Y$, by the first proposition in Remark 2.12,

$$A \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y), \quad B \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$$

and since X is p-normal on Y, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$. Clearly,

$$A' \subset U' = U \cap Y \in \tau_2', \quad B' \subset V' = V \cap Y \in \tau_1'$$

and $U' \cap V' = \varnothing$. Thus Y is p-middly normal. □

Corollary 4.12. *If a* TS (X, τ) *is normal on a* TsS (Y, τ'), *where* $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau$, *then* (Y, τ') *is* **k***–normal in the sense of* [21].

Corollary 4.13. *Let* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). *Then*

(1) *For* $Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$ *we have:*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \text{ is } p\text{-normal on } Y \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } p\text{-normal in } X \arrow[d, Leftrightarrow] \\ & Y \text{ is } p\text{-strongly normal in } X. \end{tikzcd}$$

(2) *For* $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ *the following conditions are equivalent: X is p-normal on Y, Y is p-normal in X and Y is p-strongly normal in X.*

Proof. (1) The implication is given by (1) of Theorem 4.11, and the equivalence is given by (2) of Corollary 4.7.

(2) Let Y be p-normal in X, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $A \cap B = \varnothing$, $A \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$ and $B \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y)$. Then

$$A \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y = A \cap Y, \quad B \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y = B \cap Y,$$

so that $A \subset Y$, $B \subset Y$ and so there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A = A \cap Y \subset U$ and $B = B \cap Y \subset V$. Thus X is p-normal on Y and since $\operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2 \subset p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$, it remains to use (1) above. □

Proposition 4.14. *If* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *is a* BsS *of a p-regular* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), $Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$ *and* $(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y \cup \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y, \tau_1'', \tau_2'')$ *is p-internally normal in* X, *then* Y *is p-Tychonoff.*

Proof. Since X is p-regular, Y is p-regular too and by Theorem 3.2 in [22], it suffices to prove only that Y is p-middly normal. Let

$$A' = \tau_1' \operatorname{cl} \tau_2' \operatorname{int} A' \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(Y)$$

and

$$B' = \tau_2' \operatorname{cl} \tau_1' \operatorname{int} B' \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(Y).$$

Clearly, $Y = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y$ implies that the sets

$$A = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} \tau_2' \operatorname{int} A' \ \text{ and } \ B = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} \tau_1' \operatorname{int} B'$$

are disjoint and $A, B \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y \cup \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y$. Since $(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y \cup \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y, \tau_1'', \tau_2'')$ is p-internally normal in X, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$. Let $U' = U \cap Y$, $V' = V \cap Y$. Then $A \cap Y = A' \subset U'$, $B \cap Y = B' \subset V'$ and so Y is p-middly normal. □

Theorem 4.15. *Let* $(Y, \tau_1'', \tau_2'') \subset (p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$. *Then* X *is p-normal on* $p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y \Longrightarrow X$ *p-normal on* $Y \Longrightarrow p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y$ *is p-normal on* Y.

Proof. Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $A \cap B = \varnothing$, $A = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$ and $B = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y)$. Then

$$A \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y), \quad B \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y)$$

and since X is p-normal on $p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y$, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$. Thus, X is p-normal on Y.

Now, let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$, $A \cap B = \varnothing$, $A = \tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$ and $B = \tau_2' \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y)$. Then $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = \varnothing$ since $p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Y$. Moreover,

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A, \quad \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \cap Y) = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B,$$

that is, $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A$ is 1-concentrated on Y and $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B$ is 2-concentrated on Y. Since X is p-normal on Y, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$

such that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \subset U$ and $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \subset V$. It is evident that

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y = A \subset U \cap p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y = U' \in \tau_2'$$

and

$$\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \cap Y = B \subset V \cap p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y = V' \in \tau_1'$$

so that p-cl Y is p-normal on Y. □

Definition 4.16. We say that topologies τ_1 and τ_2 on a set X are p-strongly S-related (briefly $\tau_1 S(p)\tau_2$) if the S-relation is hereditary with respect to p-closed subsets of X.

It is clear that $\tau_1 S(p)\tau_2 \Longrightarrow \tau_1 S(i)\tau_2$ in the sense of Definition 2.1.9 in [8] (($\tau_1 S(i)\tau_2$) means that the S-relation is hereditary with respect to i-closed subsets of X), and $\tau_1 <_{S(p)} \tau_2 \Longleftrightarrow (\tau_1 S(p)\tau_2 \wedge \tau_1 \subset \tau_2)$.

Theorem 4.17. *If a p-regular* BS $(X, \tau_1 <_{S(p)} \tau_2)$ *is p-normal on a* BsS (Y, τ_1'', τ_2'')*, then* (Y, τ_1'', τ_2'') *is p-Tychonoff.*

Proof. By the second implication in Theorem 4.15, the BS $(p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y, \tau_1', \tau_2')$ is also p-normal on (Y, τ_1'', τ_2''). Since $Y \in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y)$, it is obvious that the BS $(p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y, \tau_1' <_S \tau_2')$ is (d,p)-densely normal. Hence, by Proposition 2.18, $(p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y, \tau_1', \tau_2')$ is p-middly normal. Since X is p-regular, p-cl Y is also p-regular, and so, by Theorem 3.2 in [22], $(p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y, \tau_1', \tau_2')$ is p-Tychonoff. Thus, (Y, τ_1'', τ_2'') is p-Tychonoff. □

Theorem 4.18. *For a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2)*, where* $Y = X_1^i \cap X_2^i \in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$*, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *X is p-middly normal.*
(2) *X is p-normal on Y.*
(3) *X is (d,p)-densely normal.*

Proof. Since $Y \in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3). Besides, by proposition 2.18, (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (1). Hence, it remains to prove only that (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2). Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $A \cap B = \varnothing$, $A = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$, and $B = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y)$. But if $x \in Y$, then $\{x\} \in \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$ so that $A \cap Y \in \tau_2$, $B \cap Y \in \tau_1$ and so

$$A = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(X), \quad B = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y) \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(X).$$

Since X is p-middly normal, there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$. □

Theorem 4.19. *A* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is p-strongly normal in X if and only if (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is p-normal and for each $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \to (I, \omega)$ there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f^* : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ which is an extension of f, that is, $f^*(x) = f(x)$ for each point $x \in Y$.*

Proof. If Y is p-strongly normal in X, then by implications after Definition 2.11, Y is p-normal. Let us consider the families

$$\mathcal{S}_i = \big\{E : \ E \subset X \setminus Y\big\} \cup \tau_i$$

as subbases on new topologies γ_1 and γ_2 on X. First, let us prove that (X, γ_1, γ_2) is p-normal. Clearly, $Y \in \operatorname{co}\gamma_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\gamma_2$ and $\gamma_i\big|_Y = \tau_i\big|_Y$. If $A \in \operatorname{co}\gamma_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\gamma_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$, then $A, B \subset Y$ and since $\gamma_i\big|_Y = \tau_i\big|_Y$, we have $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$. Since Y is p-strongly normal in (X, τ_1, τ_2), there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $A \subset U$ and $B \subset V$. But $\tau_i \subset \gamma_i$ so that $U \in \gamma_2$, $V \in \gamma_1$ and so (X, γ_1, γ_2) is p-normal. Since $Y \in \operatorname{co}\gamma_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\gamma_2$, by Theorem 2.6 in [14], every $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (Y, \gamma_1', \gamma_2') \to (I, \omega)$ can be extended to a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f^* : (X, \gamma_1, \gamma_2) \to (I, \omega)$. Let $y \in Y$ be any point. Since the families $\mathcal{B}_i = \{U \in \tau_i : \ y \in U\}$ are bases of (X, γ_1, γ_2) at y, the function f^* is $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. at y with respect to the original topologies τ_1 and τ_2.

Conversely, let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Since Y is p-normal, by Theorem 2.7 in [13], there exists a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A) = 0$ and $f(B) = 1$. By condition, f can be extended to a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f^* : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$. Let us consider the disjoint sets

$$U = \tau_2 \operatorname{int}\Big\{x \in X : \ f^*(x) < \frac{1}{2}\Big\}$$

and

$$V = \tau_1 \operatorname{int}\Big\{x \in X : \ f^*(x) > \frac{1}{2}\Big\}.$$

Then $A \subset U$, $B \subset V$, that is, Y is p-strongly normal in X. □

Recall that by Definition 2.4 in [14], a BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is SC*-embedded in X if every bounded real-valued $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function on Y can be extended to a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function on X.

Taking into account the condition of Theorem 4.19, we introduce

Definition 4.20. We say that a BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is weakly SC*-embedded (briefly, WSC*-embedded) in (X, τ_1, τ_2) if every bounded real-valued $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function on Y can be extended to a real-valued function on X which is Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c.

Corollary 4.21. *If (X, τ_1, τ_2) is hereditarily p-normal, then every* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of X is p-strongly normal and* WSC**-embedded in X.*

Proof. Follows directly from Proposition 4.9 and Theorem 4.19. □

Theorem 4.22. *Let* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *be a p-normal* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *such that* Y SC**-embedded in* X*. Then* Y *is p-normal on* Y*.*

Proof. Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $A \cap B = \varnothing$, $A = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$ and $B = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(B \cap Y)$. Let $A_1 = A \cap Y$, $B_1 = B \cap Y$. Then $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ in Y and since Y is p-normal, by Theorem 2.7 in [13], there is a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A_1) = 0$ and $f(B_1) = 1$. Since Y is SC*-embedded in X, f can be extended to a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f^* : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$. Since A_1 is 1-dense in A and B_1 is 2-dense in B, we have $f^*(A) = 0$ and $f^*(B) = 1$. Indeed, let $x \in A \setminus A_1 = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_1 \setminus A_1$ be a point such that $f^*(x) > 0$. Since f^* is 1-l.s.c., there is $U(x) \in \tau_1$ such that $f^*(y) > 0$ for each point $g \in U(x)$. Since $f^*(A_1) = f(A_1) = 0$, we have $U(x) \cap A_1 = \varnothing$, which contradicts the fact $x \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_1$. Similarly, since f^* is 2-u.s.c. and $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B_1 = B$, we have $f^*(B) = 1$. Clearly,

$$U = \left\{x \in X : \ f^*(x) < \frac{1}{2}\right\} \in \tau_2, \quad V = \left\{x \in X : \ f^*(x) > \frac{1}{2}\right\} \in \tau_1,$$

$A \subset U$, $B \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. Thus Y is p-normal in X. □

Corollary 4.23. *If for a* BS $(X, \tau_1 <_S \tau_2)$ *there exists a d-dense p-normal* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *which is* SC**-embedded in* X*, then* (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* (d,p)*-densely normal and hence, p-middly normal.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.22, X is p-normal on Y. Hence, by Definition 2.17, (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (d,p)-densely normal and therefore, it remains to use Proposition 2.18. □

The end of the section is devoted to study of relative p-strong normality and relative WS-supernormality together with their interrelations for both the topological and the bitopological case (see also [9]).

First of all note that if (X, τ) is normal, then every closed subspace of (X, τ) is WS-supernormal in X, and if (Y, τ') is WS-supernormal in X, then (Y, τ') is normal. But for the opposite implication we have the following elementary

Example 4.24. Let us consider the natural TS $(\mathbb{R}, \omega)$ and an open interval $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$, which is normal. If $A = [c, b)$ and $B = [b, d]$ are sets, where $a < c < b < d$, then $A \in \operatorname{co}\omega'$ in $((a,b), \omega')$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\omega$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. But for any neighborhood $V(B) \in \omega$ we have $A \cap V(B) \neq \varnothing$.

Evidently, if (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-normal, then for every subset $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ the BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is (i,j)-WS-supernormal in X and so, if (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-normal and $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, then (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is p-WS-supernormal in X (clearly, for a BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ the last fact is correct for $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$).

Example 4.25. Let $(\mathbb{R}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ be the natural BS. Then it is not difficult to see that every set $Y \in \omega_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ is (i,j)-WS-supernormal in the p-normal BS $(\mathbb{R}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$, but it is not (j,i)-WS-supernormal in $(\mathbb{R}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$. Moreover, if $Y = [a,b] = (-\infty, b] \cap [a, +\infty) \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(\mathbb{R})$, then it is p-WS-supernormal in $(\mathbb{R}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$.

Proposition 4.26. *In a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *we have:*

(1) *If* $Y \in \tau_2$ *and* $\tau_1 <_N \tau_2$, *then the following implications hold:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Y \textit{ is } 2\text{-WS-}\textit{supernorm. in}\, X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \textit{ is } (1,2)\text{-WS-}\textit{supernorm. in}\, X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \textit{ is } (2,1)\text{-WS-}\textit{supernorm. in}\, X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & Y \textit{ is } 1\text{-WS-}\textit{supernorm. in}\, X\,.
\end{tikzcd}$$

(2) *If* $\tau_1 <_C \tau_2$, *then*

$$(Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \textit{ is } p\textit{-strongly normal in } X \Longrightarrow$$
$$\Longrightarrow (Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \textit{ is } 1\textit{-strongly normal in } X$$

and if $\tau_1 <_N \tau_2$, *then*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Y \textit{ is } 2\textit{-strongly normal in} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \textit{ is } d\textit{-strongly normal in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \textit{ is } p\textit{-strongly normal in} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & Y \textit{ is } 1\textit{-strongly normal in}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. (1) First of all, let us note that if $Y \in \tau_2$, then by (2) of Corollary 2.3.13 in [8], $\tau_1 <_N \tau_2$ implies that $\tau_1' <_N \tau_2'$.

For the upper horizontal implication let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Since $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1' \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is 2-WS-supernormal in X, there are neighborhoods $U'(A) \in \tau_2' \subset \tau_2$, $U'(B) \in \tau_2$ such that $U'(A) \cap U'(B) = \varnothing$ and so $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U'(A) \cap U'(B) = \varnothing$. According to (2) of Corollary 2.3.12 in [8],

$$U'(A) \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{int} \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U'(A) = \tau_1 \operatorname{int} \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U'(A) = U''(A) \in \tau_1 \subset \tau_2$$

and for the set $U(A) = U''(A) \cap Y \in \tau_1' \subset \tau_2'$ we have $U(A) \cap \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U'(B) = \varnothing$. Moreover, by Corollary 2.3.10 in [8], $\tau_1 <_N \tau_2$ implies that $\tau_1 <_C \tau_2$ and hence, (2) of Corollary 2.2.7 in [8] gives that

$$U'(B) \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{int} \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U'(B) = \tau_1 \operatorname{int} \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U'(B) = U(B) \in \tau_1.$$

Now, it is clear that $U(A) \cap U(B) = \varnothing$ and, hence, (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is $(2,1)$-WS-supernormal in X.

For the lower horizontal implication let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Since $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1' \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is $(2,1)$-WS-supernormal in X, there are neighborhoods $U(A) \in \tau_1'$, $U'(B) \in \tau_2$

such that $U(A)\cap U'(B)=\varnothing$. Since $U(A)\in\tau_1'\subset\tau_2'\subset\tau_2$, we have $U(A)\cap\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U'(B)=\varnothing$. But

$$U'(B)\subset\tau_2\operatorname{int}\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U'(B)=\tau_1\operatorname{int}\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U'(B)=U(B)\in\tau_1$$

and $U(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$. Thus (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is 1-WS-supernormal in X.

For the left vertical implication let $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Since $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1\subset\operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is 2-WS-supernormal in X, there are neighborhoods $U'(A)\in\tau_2'$, $U(B)\in\tau_2$ such that $U'(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$ and so $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U'(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$. Furthermore, according to (2) of Corollary 2.3.12 in [8],

$$U'(A)\subset\tau_2'\operatorname{int}\tau_2'\operatorname{cl}U'(A)=\tau_1'\operatorname{int}\tau_2'\operatorname{cl}U'(A)=U(A)\in\tau_1'$$

and $U(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$ so that (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is $(2,1)$-WS-supernormal in X.

Finally, for the right vertical implication let $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Since $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1\subset\operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is $(1,2)$-WS-supernormal in X, there are neighborhoods $U'(A)\in\tau_2'$, $U(B)\in\tau_1$ such that $U'(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$. Hence $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U'(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$ and by (2) of Corollary 2.3.12 in [8],

$$U'(A)\subset\tau_2'\operatorname{int}\tau_2'\operatorname{cl}U'(A)=\tau_1'\operatorname{int}\tau_2'\operatorname{cl}U'(A)=U(A)\in\tau_1'.$$

Clearly $U(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$ and, thus, (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is 1-WS-supernormal in X.

(2) First, let A, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Since $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'\subset\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is p-strongly normal in X, there are neighborhoods $U'(A)\in\tau_2$, $U(B)\in\tau_1$ such that $U'(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$. Clearly, $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U'(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$ and according to (2) of Corollary 2.2.7 in [8],

$$U'(A)\subset\tau_2\operatorname{int}\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U'(A)=\tau_1\operatorname{int}\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U'(A)=U(A)\in\tau_1,$$

where $U(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$. Thus (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is 1-strongly normal in X.

Furthermore, let $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Since $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'\subset\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is 2-strongly normal in X, there are neighborhoods $U(A)$, $U'(B)\in\tau_2$ such that $U(A)\cap U'(B)=\varnothing$ and so $U(A)\cap\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U'(B)=\varnothing$. Hence, by (2) of Corollary 2.3.12 in [8],

$$U'(B)\subset\tau_2\operatorname{int}\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U'(B)=\tau_1\operatorname{int}\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U'(B)=U(B)\in\tau_1,$$

$U(A)\cap U(B)=\varnothing$ and, hence, (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is p-strongly normal in X. The horizontal implications follow from the first implication of (2) since $\tau_1<_N\tau_2$ implies $\tau_1<_C\tau_2$. □

Proposition 4.27. *For a* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *If* $Y\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$ *and* (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *is p-strongly normal in* X*, then* (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *is* (i,j)-WS-*supernormal in* X*.*

(2) *If* $Y \in \tau_j$ *and* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* (i,j)-WS-*supernormal in* X*, then* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* p*-strongly normal in* X*.*

Proof. (1) Let $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_i$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then $B' = B \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_j$ and since (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is p-strongly normal in X, there are disjoint sets $U' \in \tau_j$, $V' \in \tau_i$ such that $A \subset U'$ and $B' \subset V'$. Evidently, if $U = U' \cap Y$, $V = V' \cup (X \setminus Y)$, then $U \in \tau'_j$, $V \in \tau_i$, $A \subset U$, $B \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$ so that (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is (i,j)-WS-supernormal in X.

(2) Let $Y \in \tau_j$, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_i$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_j$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then $A \cap \tau_j \operatorname{cl} B = \varnothing$ and since (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is (i,j)-WS-supernormal in X, there are sets $U \in \tau'_j$, $V \in \tau_i$ such that $A \subset U$, $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} B \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. Clearly $U \in \tau_j$, $B \subset V$ and, hence, (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is p-strongly normal in X. □

Corollary 4.28. *For a* BsS (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *If* $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ *and* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* p*-strongly normal in* X*, then* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* p-WS-*supernormal in* X*.*
(2) *If* $Y \in \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$ *and* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* p-WS-*supernormal in* X*, then* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* p*-strongly normal in* X*.*
(3) *If* $Y \in \tau_1 \cap \tau_2 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$*, then the following conditions are equivalent:* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* $(1,2)$-WS-*supernormal in* X*,* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* $(2,1)$-WS-*supernormal in* X*,* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* p-WS-*supernormal in* X *and* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* p*-strongly normal in* X*.*

Therefore, the equivalences remain valid for a BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *if* $Y \in \tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_1$*.*

Proof. (1) and (2) follow directly from (1) and (2) of Proposition 4.27, respectively.

(3) By (1) and (2) of Proposition 4.27, if $Y \in \tau_2 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, then (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is $(1,2)$-WS-supernormal in X if and only if (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is p-strongly normal in X and if $Y \in \tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, then (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is $(2,1)$-WS-supernormal in X if and only if (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is p-strongly normal in X.

The rest is obvious. □

Corollary 4.29. *For a* TsS (Y, τ') *of a* TS (X, τ) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *If* $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau$ *and* (Y, τ') *is strongly normal in* X*, then* (Y, τ') *is* WS-*supernormal in* X*, and if* $Y \in \tau$ *and* (Y, τ') *is* WS-*supernormal in* X*, then* (Y, τ') *is strongly normal in* X*.*
(2) *If* $Y \in \tau \cap \operatorname{co}\tau$*, then* (Y, τ') *is* WS-*supernormal in* X *if and only if* (Y, τ') *is strongly normal in* X*.*

In connection with Corollary 4.29 and so, with the bitopological case, we consider it necessary to give the following elementary

Example 4.30. Let $X = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$, $\tau = \{\varnothing, \{c\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{c, d, e\}, X\}$ and $Y \in \{a, b, d\}$. Then (Y, τ') is WS-supernormal in X, but it is not strongly normal in X.

Now, if $\tau = \{\varnothing, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}, \{d, e\}, \{a, d, e\}, \{b, d, e\}, \{a, b, d, e\}, X\}$ and $Y = \{a, d, e\}$, then (Y, τ') is strongly normal in X, but it is not WS-supernormal in X.

5. (i, j)-Relative Real Normalities

Proposition 5.1. *Let* $(Z, \tau_1'', \tau_2'') \subset (Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$. *Then the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *If* Y *is* p*-normal or* Y *is* p*-weakly realnormal in* X*, then* Z *is* p*-weakly realnormal in* X.

(2) *If* Y *is* p*-realnormal in* X*, then* Z *is also* p*-realnormal in* X.

Moreover, if $(Y, \tau_1''', \tau_2''') \subset (Y_1, \tau_1'', \tau_2'') \subset (X_1, \tau_1', \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, *then*

(3) Y_1 *is* p*-weakly realnormal in* X_1 *implies that* Y *is* p*-weakly realnormal in* X *too.*

Proof. (1) First, let Y be p-normal, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then $A \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and by Theorem 2.7 in [13], there is a $(1, 2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A \cap Y) = 0$ and $f(B \cap Z) = 1$. It is clear that f is Z-$(1, 2)$-l.u.s.c., $f(A \cap Z) \subset \{0\}$ and $f(B \cap Y) \subset \{1\}$, so that Z is p-weakly realnormal in X.

Now, if Y is p-weakly realnormal in X, then evidently Z is also p-weakly realnormal in X.

(2) The condition is obvious.

(3) Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Since Y_1 is p-weakly realnormal in X_1, for the disjoint sets $A \cap X_1 \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ and $B \cap X_1 \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ there is a $(1, 2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (Y_1, \tau_1'', \tau_2'') \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A \cap Y_1) \subset \{0\}$ and $f(B \cap Y_1) \subset \{1\}$. Clearly, $\varphi = f\big|_Y : (Y, \tau_1''', \tau_2''') \to (I, \omega)$ is $(1, 2)$-l.u.s.c., $\varphi(A \cap Y) \subset \{0\}$, $\varphi(B \cap Y) \subset \{1\}$ and so $Y$is p-weakly realnormal in X. □

Corollary 5.2. *If a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* p*-normal, then* Y *is* p*-weakly realnormal in* X.

Proof. Follows directly from (1) of Proposition 5.1 for $Y = Z$. □

Proposition 5.3. *If a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *is p-realnormal in a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2)*, then Y is p-normal in X.*

Proof. Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then, by condition, there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A) = \{0\}$ and $f(B) = \{1\}$. Let $U = \tau_2 \operatorname{int}\{x \in X : \ f(x) < 1/2\}$ and $V = \tau_1 \operatorname{int}\{x \in X : \ f(x) > 1/2\}$. Then $A \cap Y \subset U$ and $B \cap Y \subset V$. $\square$

Theorem 5.4. *A* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is p-strongly realnormal in X if and only if Y is p-srtongly normal in X.*

Proof. First, let Y be p-strongly realnormal in X, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A) = \{0\}$ and $f(B) = \{1\}$. Let $U = \tau_2 \operatorname{int}\{x \in X : \ f(x) < 1/2\}$ and $V = \tau_1 \operatorname{int}\{x \in X : \ f(x) > 1/2\}$. Then $A \subset U$, $B \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$, so that Y is p-srtongly normal in X.

Conversely, let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then, by Theorem 4.19, there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f^* : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f^*(A) = \{0\}$ and $f^*(B) = \{1\}$, that is, Y is p-srtongly normal in X. $\square$

Corollary 5.5. *For a p-closed* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *we have:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \text{ is p-normal on } Y \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is p-normal in } X \arrow[d, Leftrightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is p-strongly realnormal in } X \arrow[r, Leftrightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is p-strongly normal in } X \\
Y \text{ is p-realnormal in } X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is p-weakly realnormal in } X.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. The implications and equivalences are immediate consequences of Theorem 5.4, (1) of Corollary 4.13 and the implications after Proposition 2.15. $\square$

Theorem 5.6. *For a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2)*, where $Y \in \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$, we have:*

(1) *Y is p-weakly realnormal in X if and only if Y is p-realnormal in X.*

(2) *Y is p-normal if and only if Y is p-strongly realnormal in X.*

Proof. (1) Clearly, it suffices to prove only the implication from the left to the right. Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then, by (1) of Definition 2.14, there is a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \to$

(I,ω) such that $f(A\cap Y)\subset\{0\}$ and $f(B\cap Y)\subset\{1\}$. Let us define $f^*:(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)\to(I,\omega)$ as follows: $f^*(x)=f(x)$ if $x\in Y$ and $f^*(X\setminus Y)=\{1\}$. Then, taking into account (3) of Proposition 2.15, f^* is the required Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function on X.

(2) By Theorem 5.4 and the implications after Definition 2.11, it suffices to prove only the implication from the left to the right. let $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Then, by (1) of Theorem 2.7 in [13], there is a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f:(Y,\tau_1',\tau_2')\to(I,\omega)$ such that $f(A)=\{0\}$ and $f(B)=\{1\}$. Let $f^*:(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)\to(I,\omega)$ be any function such that $f^*\big|_Y=f$. Then $Y\in\tau_1\cap\tau_2$ implies that f^* is Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c., and so Y is p-strongly normal in X. □

Proposition 5.7. *Any* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of a p-normal* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *is p-realnormal in X.*

Proof. Let $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Then, by Theorem 2.7 in [13], there is a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f:(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)\to(I,\omega)$ such that $f(A)=0$ and $f(B)=1$. It is clear, that for any $Y\subset X$, the function f is Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. and, hence, it remains to use (2) of Definition 2.14. □

Proposition 5.8. *If (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is p-weakly realnormal in a* R-p-T_1 BS (X,τ_1,τ_2)*, then (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is p-Tychonoff and so, p-almost completely regular.*

Proof. Let (Y,τ_1',τ_2') be p-weakly realnormal in X, $x\in Y$, $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ and $x\,\overline{\in}\,F$. Then $x\,\overline{\in}\,\tau_i\operatorname{cl}F$ and since X is R-p-T_1. By (1) of Definition 2.14, there is a Y-(i,j)-l.u.s.c. function $f:(Y,\tau_1',\tau_2')\to(I,\omega)$ such that

$$f(\tau_i\operatorname{cl}F\cap Y)=f(F)\subset\{0\}\ \text{ and }\ f(x)\subset\{1\}.$$

Thus Y is p-Tychonoff, and it remains to use the implications after Definition 2.6. □

Theorem 5.9. *If $(X,\tau_1<_S\tau_2)$ is p-normal on (Y,τ_1',τ_2'), where $Y\in d$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$, then Y is p-realnormal in X.*

Proof. We will use the condition (2) of Proposition 2.15. Let $A,B\subset Y$, $A\neq\varnothing\neq B$ and $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}A\cap\tau_2\operatorname{cl}B=\varnothing$. Since X is p-normal on Y, taking into account Remark 2.12, there are disjoint sets $U\in\tau_2$, $V\in\tau_1$ such that $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}A\subset U$ and $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}B\subset V$. Clearly, $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U\cap V=\varnothing=U\cap\tau_2\operatorname{cl}V$, and so, $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U\cap\tau_2\operatorname{cl}B=\varnothing$. Now, by Remark 1.3.4 in [8], $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U\in(1,2)$-$\mathcal{CD}(X)$ and by remark after Lemma 2.16, $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U$ is 1-concentrated on Y since $Y\in 2$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$. X is p-normal on Y implies that there are disjoint sets $E\in\tau_2$, $W\in\tau_1$ such that $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U\subset E$ and $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}B\subset W$.

It is evident that $E \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} W = \varnothing$. Therefore, we have $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U \subset E$, $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} W$ and $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} W = \varnothing$, where $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(X)$, $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} W \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{CD}(X)$. Since X is (d,p)-densely normal, by Proposition 2.18, X is p-middly normal and so, by Theorem 2.2 in [22], there is a $(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U) = 0$ and $f(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} W) = 1$. Clearly, f is Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. $f(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A) \subset \{0\}$, $f(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B) \subset \{1\}$ and by (2) of Proposition 2.15, Y is p-realnormal in X. □

6. (i,j)-Relative Properties of Compactness Type

Definition 6.1. A BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-compact (i-compact) in X if every p-open (i-open) covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ of X contains a finite subcovering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$ such that $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$.

Proposition 6.2. *If a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *is* (i,j)-S-T$_2$ *in* (X, τ_1, τ_2) *and p-compact in X, then Y is (i,j)-superregular in X.*

Proof. If $z \in Y$, $z \overline{\in} F$ and $F \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i$, then for each point $x \in F$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U_x(z) \in \tau_i$, $U_z(x) \in \tau_j$ and hence, the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \big\{ U_z(x) : \ x \in F \big\} \cup \{X \setminus F\}$ is a p-open covering of X. Since Y is p-compact in X, there are points $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in F$ such that $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{n} U_z(x_k) \cup (X \setminus F)$. Then $F \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{n} U_z(x_k) = U \in \tau_j$, $z \in \bigcap\limits_{k=1}^{n} U_{x_k}(z) = V \in \tau_i$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. Thus Y is (i,j)-superregular in X. □

Corollary 6.3. *If* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *is* p-S-T$_2$ *in* (X, τ_1, τ_2) *and p-compact in X, then Y is p-superregular in X.*

Proposition 6.4. *If* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *is* $(1,2)$-S-T$_2$ *or* $(2,1)$-S-T$_2$ *in X and p-compact in X, then Y is p-strongly normal in X.*

Proof. Let $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1'$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2'$, $A \cap B = \varnothing$ and, for example, Y is $(1,2)$-S-T$_2$ in X. Clearly, $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap B = \varnothing$, and by Proposition 6.2, Y is $(1,2)$-superregular in X. Hence, Y is $(1,2)$-strongly regular in X and so for each point $x \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U_B(x) \in \tau_2$, $U_x(B) \in \tau_1$. It is clear that the family

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \big\{ U_B(x) : \ x \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \big\} \cup \{X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A\}$$

is a p-open covering of X and since Y is p-compact in X, there are points $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A$ such that $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{n} U_B(x_k) \cup (X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A)$.

It is obvious that

$$A = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} U_B(x_k) = U \in \tau_2, \quad B \subset \bigcap_{k=1}^{n} U_{x_k}(B) = V \in \tau_1$$

and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. Thus Y is p-strongly normal in X. $\square$

Definition 6.5. A BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i, j)-internally compact in X if every i-closed subset of X, contained in Y, is j-compact.

Proposition 6.6. *If (Y, τ_1', τ_2') is a p-internally compact* BsS *in a p-*T_2 BS (X, τ_1, τ_2)*, then Y is p-internally normal in X.*

Proof. Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $A, B \subset Y$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then, by condition, A is 2-compact and B is 1-compact. If $x \in A$ is any point, then for each point $y \in B$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U_x(y) \in \tau_1$ and $U_y(x) \in \tau_2$. Clearly, $B \subset \cup U_x(y)$ and since B is 1-compact, there are points $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m \in B$ such that $B \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{m} U_x(y_k) = U_x(B) \in \tau_1$. If $U(x) = \bigcap\limits_{k=1}^{m} U_{y_k}(x) \in \tau_2$, then $U(x) \cap U_x(B) = \varnothing$. Hence, for each $x \in A$ there are disjoint sets $U(x) \in \tau_2$ and $U_x(B) \in \tau_1$. Clearly, $A \subset \bigcup\limits_{x \in A} U(x)$ and since A is 2-compact, there are points $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ such that $A \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{n} U(x_k) = U(A) \in \tau_2$. Let $U(B) = \bigcap\limits_{k=1}^{n} U_{x_k}(B) \in \tau_1$. Then $U(A) \cap U(B) = \varnothing$ and thus Y is p-internally normal in X. $\square$

Definition 6.7. A BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-Lindelöff (i-Lindelöff) if every p-open (i-open) covering of X contains a countable subcovering and hence, a BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-Lindelöff (i-Lindelöff) in X if every p-open (i-open) covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ of X contains a countable subcovering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$ such that $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \{U_n : n = \overline{1, \infty}\} \subset \tau_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \{V_n : n = \overline{1, \infty}\} \subset \tau_2$ be any two countable families in a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2)*. Then there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_1$ and $V \in \tau_2$ such that $\cup \boldsymbol{\xi} \setminus \cup \{\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V_n : n = \overline{1, \infty}\} \subset U$ and $\cup \boldsymbol{\eta} \setminus \cup \{\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_n : n = \overline{1, \infty}\} \subset V$.*

Proof. Obviously we may assume that $U_n \subset U_{n+1}$ and $V_n \subset V_{n+1}$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Now, let $G_k = U_k \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V_k \in \tau_1$ and $W_k = V_k \setminus \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_k \in \tau_2$ for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$. It follows that the sets $U = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} G_k \in \tau_1$ and

$V=\bigcup\limits_{l=1}^{\infty}W_l\in\tau_2$ are disjoint, $\cup\boldsymbol{\xi}\setminus\cup\big\{\tau_1\operatorname{cl}V_n:\ n=\overline{1,\infty}\big\}\subset U$ and $\cup\boldsymbol{\eta}\setminus\cup\big\{\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U_n:\ n=\overline{1,\infty}\big\}\subset V$. □

Lemma 6.9. *If a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *is p-Lindelöff, then every i-closed subset of X is j-Lindelöff.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'=\{U\}\subset\tau_j$ be any j-open covering of a set $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$. Then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}=\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'\cup\{X\setminus F\}$ is a p-open covering of X and since X is p-Lindelöff, by Definition 6.7 there is a subfamily $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}\subset\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ such that $|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}|\le\aleph_0$ and $X=\cup\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$. If $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}'=\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}\setminus\{X\setminus F\}$, then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}'\subset\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$, $|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}'|\le\aleph_0$ and $F\subset\cup\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}'$, so that F is j-Lindelöff. □

Proposition 6.10. *If a* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *is p-regular in X and p-Lindelöff, then Y is p-strongly normal in X.*

Proof. Let $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$. Since Y is p-regular in X, for each point $a\in A$ and each point $b\in B$ there are neighborhoods $U(a)\in\tau_2$ and $U(b)\in\tau_1$ such that

$$\big(\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U(a)\cap B\big)\cup\big(\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U(b)\cap A\big)=\varnothing.$$

Since Y is p-Lindelöff, $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ and $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$, by Lemma 6.9, there are countable sets $A_1\subset A$ and $B_1\subset B$ such that

$$A\subset\cup\big\{U(a):\ a\in A_1\big\}\ \text{ and }\ B\subset\cup\big\{U(b):\ b\in B_2\big\}.\qquad(*)$$

Thus, by Lemma 6.8 there are disjoint sets $U\in\tau_2$, $V\in\tau_1$ such that

$$\bigcup_{a\in A_1}U(a)\setminus\cup\big\{\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U(b):\ b\in B_1\big\}\subset U$$

and

$$\bigcup_{b\in B_1}U(b)\setminus\cup\big\{\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U(a):\ a\in A_1\big\}\subset V.$$

Clearly

$$\Big(A\cap\Big(\bigcup_{b\in B_1}\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U(b)\Big)\Big)\cup\Big(B\cap\Big(\bigcup_{a\in A_1}\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U(a)\Big)\Big)=\varnothing$$

and by $(*)$, $A\subset U$, $B\subset V$. Thus Y is p-storngly normal in X. □

Corollary 6.11. *If a* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *is p-Lindelöff and X is p-regular (respectively, Y is p-superregular in X, Y is p-strongly regular in X, Y is p-free regular in X), then Y is p-strongly normal in X.*

Proof. Follows directly from implications after Definition 2.2. □

Corollary 6.12. *Under the hypotheses of Proposition* 6.10, *Y is p-strongly realnormal in X.*

Proof. Follows directly from Theorem 5.4. $\square$

Corollary 6.13. *Under the hypotheses of Proposition* 6.10*, Y is p-normal, Y is p-quasi normal in X and Y is p-normal in X.*

Proof. The conditions are immediate consequences of implications after Definition 2.11. $\square$

Corollary 6.14. *Under the hypotheses of Corollary* 6.11*, Y is p-normal, Y is p-quasi normal in X and Y is p-normal in X.*

Proposition 6.15. *Let $\gamma_i \subset \tau_i$ for a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). *If (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is p-compact in (X, τ_1, τ_2) and $(Y, \gamma'_1, \gamma'_2)$ is p-S-T_2 in (X, γ_1, γ_2) (in particular, if (X, γ_1, γ_2) is p-T_2), then $\gamma'_i = \tau'_i$.*

Proof. Contrary: $\gamma'_i \neq \tau'_i$. Then there is a set $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_i$ and a point $y \in Y \setminus F$ such that $y \in \gamma'_i \operatorname{cl} F$ since $\gamma_i \subset \tau_i$. By condition $(Y, \gamma'_1, \gamma'_2)$ is p-S-T_2 in (X, γ_1, γ_2) and by (18) of Definition 2.1 for each point $x \in X \setminus \{y\}$ there are disjoint sets $U(x) \in \gamma_2$ $(U(x) \in \gamma_1)$ and $U_x(y) \in \gamma_1$ $(U_x(y) \in \gamma_2)$. Let $\Phi = \tau_i \operatorname{cl} F$. Then

$$\big\{U(x) : \; U(x) \in \gamma_j, \; x \in X \setminus \{y\}\big\} \cup \{X \setminus \Phi\}$$

is a p-open covering of (X, τ_1, τ_2) as $\gamma_i \subset \tau_i$. Since (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is p-compact in (X, τ_1, τ_2), there is a finite set $A \subset X \setminus \{y\}$ such that $Y \subset (X \setminus \Phi) \cup \big(\bigcup\limits_{x \in A} U(x)\big)$. Hence for the neighborhood $U'(y) \in \gamma_i$, where $U'(y) = \bigcap\limits_{x \in A} \big\{U_x(y) : \; U_x(y) \in \gamma_i\big\}$, we have $U'(y) \subset X \setminus \Phi$ and so $U'(y) \cap F = \varnothing$. If $U(y) = U'(y) \cap Y$, then $U(y) \in \gamma'_i$ and $U(y) \cap F = \varnothing$ so that $y \overline{\in} \gamma'_i \operatorname{cl} F$. A contradiction. $\square$

Proposition 6.16. *Let $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (X_1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ be a d-continuous function and (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) be p-Lindelöff in (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then $(f(Y), \gamma'_1, \gamma'_2)$ is p-Lindelöff in $(X_1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{U_\alpha : \; \alpha \in D\}$ be any p-open covering of X_1. Then the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}})$ is a p-open covering of X and by condition there is a countable subfamily $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}' \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ such that $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}'$. Clearly, for each $V_\alpha \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ there is $U_\alpha \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ such that $V_\alpha = f^{-1}(U_\alpha)$. Hence

$$f(Y) \subset f\big(\cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}'\big) = \cup \big\{f(V_\alpha) : \; V_\alpha \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}'\big\} = \cup \big\{U_\alpha : \; \alpha \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'\big\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}' \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$ is countable. $\square$

Lemma 6.17. *If a* BsS (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is (j, i)-superregular in X and Y is j-Lindelöff, then Y is is (i, j)-perfectly located in X.*

Proof. Let $Y \subset U$, where $U \in \tau_j$. Then $Y \cap F = \varnothing$, where $F = X \setminus U \in \operatorname{co} \tau_j$. Since Y is (j, i)-superregular in X, for each point $x \in Y$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(x) \in \tau_j$ and $U_x(F) \in \tau_i$. Clearly, $\{U(x) :\ x \in Y\}$ is a j-open covering of Y and by condition there is a countable set of point $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset Y$ such that $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} U(x_k)$. Moreover, since $U(x_k) \cap U_{x_k}(F) = \varnothing$, we have $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} U(x_k) \cap U_{x_k}(F) = \varnothing$ and so

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \tau_i \operatorname{cl} U(x_k) \cap \Big(\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} U_{x_k}(F) \Big) = \varnothing.$$

Therefore

$$Y \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \tau_i \operatorname{cl} U(x_k) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Phi_k \subset X \setminus \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} U_{x_k}(F) \subset X \setminus F = U,$$

where $\Phi_k \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i$ for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$. Thus Y is (i, j)-perfectly located in X. $\square$

Proposition 6.18. *Let (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) be a (j, i)-superregular* BsS *in a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). *Then the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *If Y is j-Lindelöff, then Y is j-Lindelöff in X and Y is (i, j)-perfectly located in X.*
2. *If Y is p-Lindelöff in X and Y is (j, i)-perfectly located in X, then Y is i-Lindelöff.*

Proof. (1) By Lemma 6.17, it suffices to prove only that if Y is j-Lindelöff, then Y is j-Lindelöff in X. Indeed, if $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \big\{U_\alpha :\ \alpha \in D\big\}$ is any i-open covering of X, then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_Y = \big\{U_\alpha \cap Y :\ \alpha \in D\big\}$ is the j-open covering of Y, consisting of j-open in Y sets. Hence, by condition, there is a countable subfamily $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'_Y = \big\{U_{\alpha_k} \cap Y :\ k = \overline{1, \infty}\big\}$ such that $Y = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} (U_{\alpha_k} \cap Y)$. Clearly, $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} U_{\alpha_k}$ and so Y is j-Lindelöff in X.

(2) Now, let Y be p-Lindelöff in X and Y be (j, i)-perfectly located in X. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}' = \big\{U'_\alpha :\ \alpha \in D\big\} \subset \tau'_i$ is any i-open covering of Y. Let $U_\alpha \in \tau_i$, $U_\alpha \cap Y = U'_\alpha$ for each $\alpha \in D$ and $W = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in D} U_\alpha$. Then $W \in \tau_i$ and $Y \subset W$. Since Y is (j, i)-perfectly located in X, there is a countable family $\big\{F_n :\ n = \overline{1, \infty}\big\} \subset \operatorname{co} \tau_j$ such that $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n \subset W$. Hence $X \setminus W \subset \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus F_n)$, i.e. $X \setminus W \subset X \setminus F_n$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Hence, for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$, the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n = \big\{U_\alpha :\ \alpha \in D\big\} \cup \{X \setminus F_n\}$ is a p-open covering of X, and since Y is p-Lindelöff in X and $(Y \cap F_n) \cap (X \setminus F_n) = \varnothing$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$, there is a

countable subfamily $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'_n = \{U'_\alpha = U_\alpha \cap Y : \ U_\alpha \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n\} \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$ such that $Y \cap F_n \subset \cup\{U'_\alpha : \ U'_\alpha \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'_n\}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'_c = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'_n$. Then

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty}(F_n \cap Y) = Y = \cup\{U'_\alpha : U'_\alpha \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'_c\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'_e$ is also countable and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'_c \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$, i.e., Y is i-Lindelöff. □

Theorem 6.19. *Let $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (X_1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ be a d-closed and d-continuous function and $(Y, \gamma'_1, \gamma'_2) \subset (X_1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ be p-Lindelöff in X_1. Moreover, let $f^{-1}(x)$ be p-Lindelöff in X for each $x \in X_1$. Then $(f^{-1}(Y), \tau'_1, \tau'_2)$ is p-Lindelöff in X.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{U_\alpha : \ \alpha \in D\}$ be any p-open covering of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). For each point $x \in X_1$ there exists a countable subfamily $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_x \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ such that $f^{-1}(x) \subset U_x = \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_x = U^1_x \cup U^2_x$, where $U^i_x \in \tau_i$. Since f is d-closed, and so, i-closed, there is an i-open neighborhood $W^i_x \in \gamma_i$ such that $f^{-1}(W^i_x) \subset U^i_x$. Since $(Y, \gamma'_1, \gamma'_2)$ is p-Lindelöff in X_1, there is a countable subset $X' \subset X_1$ such that $Y \subset W = \cup\{W_x : x \in X'\}$, where $W_x = W^1_x \cup W^2_x$ for each $x \in X'$. Therefore

$$\begin{gathered} f^{-1}(Y) \subset f^{-1}(W) \subset \\ \subset \cup\{U_x = U^1_x \cup U^2_x : \ x \in X'\} = \cup\{\cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_x : \ x \in X'\}. \end{gathered}$$

Hence, the subfamily $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}' = \cup\{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_x : x \in X'\}$ of the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ covers $f^{-1}(Y)$ and since each $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_x$ is countable, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$ is also countable and so, $f^{-1}(Y)$ is p-Lindelöff in X. □

Theorem 6.20. *For a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *If (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-regular, $(Z, \tau''_1, \tau''_2) \subset (Y, \tau'_1, \tau'_2) \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ and Y is p-Lindelöff, then Z is p-realnormal in X.*
2. *If $(Y, \tau'''_1, \tau'''_2) \subset (Y_1, \tau''_1, \tau''_2) \subset (X_1, \tau'_1, \tau'_2) \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, $X_1 \in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ and Y_1 is p-Lindelöff in X_1, then Y is p-Lindelöff in X.*
3. *If $(Y, \tau'''_1, \tau'''_2) \subset (p\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Y, \tau''_1, \tau''_2) \subset (X_1, \tau'_1, \tau'_2) \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ and $X_1 \in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, then Y is p-Lindelöff in X if and only if Y is p-Lindelöff in X_1.*
4. *If $(Y, \tau'_1, \tau'_2) \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, Y is p-Lindelöff in X, $X_1 \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$ and $Y_1 \subset Y \cap X_1$, then Y_1 is p-Lindelöff in X_1.*

Proof. (1) It is evident that Y is p-regular in X and by Proposition 6.10, Y is p-strongly normal in X. Therefore, by Theorem 5.4, Y is p-strongly realnormal in X. Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then $A \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_1$, $B \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau'_2$ and by (3) of Definition 2.14, there is a Y-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. function $f : (X, \tau_1, \tau_2) \to (I, \omega)$ such that $f(A \cap Y) = \{0\}$ and $f(B \cap Y) = \{1\}$. Clearly, f is Z-$(1,2)$-l.u.s.c. and $f(A \cap Z) \subset \{0\}$, $f(B \cap Z) \subset \{1\}$. Thus, by (3) of Proposition 2.15, Z is p-realnormal in X.

(2) Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{U_\alpha : \alpha \in D\}$ be a p-open covering of X. Then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_{X_1} = \big\{U_\alpha \cap X_1 : \alpha \in D\big\}$ is a p-open covering of X_1 since $X_1 \in d$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$. Hence, by condition, there is a countable subfamily $\{U_{\alpha_k} \cap X_1\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_{X_1}$ such that $Y_1 \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} (U_{\alpha_k} \cap X_1)$. Now, it is obvious that $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} U_{\alpha_k}$ and thus Y is p-Lindelöff in X.

(3) Let, first, Y be p-Lindelöff in X_1 and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{U_\alpha : \alpha \in D\}$ be a p-open covering of X. Then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_{X_1} = \big\{U_\alpha \cap X_1 : \alpha \in D\big\}$ is a p-open covering of X_1 since $X_1 \in d$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$. Hence, by condition, there is a countable subfamily $\{U_{\alpha_k} \cap X_1\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_{X_1}$ such that $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} (U_{\alpha_k} \cap X_1)$. Hence, it is obvious that $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} U_{\alpha_k}$ and so Y is p-Lindelöff in X.

Conversely, let Y be p-Lindelöff in X and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_{X_1} = \big\{U'_\alpha : \alpha \in D\big\}$ be a p-open covering of X_1. Since $p\text{-}\mathrm{cl}\, Y = \tau_1 \mathrm{cl}\, Y \cap \tau_2 \mathrm{cl}\, Y \subset X_1$, we have

$$X \setminus X_1 \subset X \setminus p\text{-}\mathrm{cl}\, Y = (X \setminus \tau_1 \mathrm{cl}\, Y) \cup (X \setminus \tau_2 \mathrm{cl}\, Y).$$

Therefore

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_1 \cup \big\{X \setminus \tau_1 \mathrm{cl}\, Y, X \setminus \tau_2 \mathrm{cl}\, Y\big\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_1 \cap X_1 = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_{X_1}$, is a p-open covering of X. Since Y is p-Lindelöff in X and

$$Y \cap \big((X \setminus \tau_1 \mathrm{cl}\, Y) \cup (X \setminus \tau_2 \mathrm{cl}\, Y)\big) = \varnothing,$$

there is a countable subfamily $\{U_{\alpha_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_1$ such that $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} U_{\alpha_k}$. But $Y \subset X_1$ and so $Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} U'_{\alpha_k}$. Thus, Y is p-Lindelöff in X_1.

(4) Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_{X_1} = \{U'_\alpha : \alpha \in D\}$ be a p-open covering of X_1 and

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \big\{U_\alpha : U_\alpha \cap X_1 = U'_\alpha,\ \alpha \in D\big\} \cup \big\{X \setminus \tau_1 \mathrm{cl}\, X_1, X \setminus \tau_2 \mathrm{cl}\, X_1\big\}.$$

Then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is a p-open covering of X and since Y is p-Lindelöff in X, there is a countable subfamily $\{U_{\alpha_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ such that $Y_1 \subset Y \subset \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} U_{\alpha_k}$. Since $Y_1 \subset X_1$, we have

$$Y_1 \cap \big((X \setminus \tau_1 \mathrm{cl}\, X_1) \cup (X \setminus \tau_2 \mathrm{cl}\, X_1)\big) = \varnothing,$$

so that $\{U_{\alpha_k} \cap X_1\}_{k=1}^{\infty} = \{U'_{\alpha_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_{X_1}$. Thus Y_1 is p-Lindelöff in X_1. □

Corollary 6.21. *For a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *If* $Y \in d\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, *then* Y *is p-Lindelöff in* X *if and only if* Y *is p-Lindelöff.*
(2) *If* $(Y, \tau_1'', \tau_2'') \subset (Z, \tau_1', \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ *and* Z *is p-Lindelöff, then* Y *is p-Lindelöff in* X.

Proof. (1) It suffices to suppose in (3) of Theorem 6.20 that $Y = p\text{-}\mathrm{cl}\, Y = X_1$.

(2) Suppose in (2) of Theorem 6.20 that $Y_1 = X_1 = Z$. □

Remark 6.22. It is clear that Theorem 6.20 remains correct if p-Lindelöffnees is changed by p-compactness.

Definition 6.23. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then

(1) Y is (i,j)-quasi paracompact in X if for each i-open covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ of X one can find a covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ of Y by i-open in Y sets which refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and is j-locally finite at each point of Y.
(2) Y is (i,j)-paracompact in X if for each i-open covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ of X there exists a family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \subset \tau_i$ which refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is j-locally finite at each point of Y.
(3) Y is (i,j)-strongly paracompact in X if for each i-open covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ of X there exists an i-open covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ of X which refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and is j-locally finite at each point of Y.

It is clear that if (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i,j)-R R-paracompact in the sense of (6) of Definition 1.1, then any BsS Y of X is (i,j)-strongly paracompact in X, and so Y is (i,j)-paracompact in X and (i,j)-quasi paracompact in X.

It is clear that if $Y \in \tau_i$, then Y is (i,j)-quasi paracompact in X if and only if Y is (i,j)-paracompact in X.

Remark 6.24. For a BS $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ of a BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ we have the following implications:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Y \text{ is 1-strongly paracomact in } X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (1,2)\text{-strongly paracompact in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is 1-paracompact in } X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (1,2)\text{-paracompact in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is 1-quasi paracompact in } X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } (1,2)\text{-quasi paracompact in } X\,,
\end{tikzcd}$$

and

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Y \text{ is } (2,1)\text{-strongly paracompact in } X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } 2\text{-strongly paracompact in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } (2,1)\text{-paracompact in } X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } 2\text{-paracompact in } X \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
Y \text{ is } (2,1)\text{-quasi paracompact in } X \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & Y \text{ is } 2\text{-quasi paracompact in } X\,.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Theorem 6.25. *If* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *is a* BsS *of an* (i,j)*-regular* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), $\tau_j C \tau_i$, $\tau_i N \tau_j$ *and* Y *is* j*-Lindelöff in* X, *then* Y *is* (i,j)*-paracompact in* X.

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{U\}$ be any i-open covering of X. Then for each point $x \in X$ there is a neighborhood $U(x) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ such that $x \in U(x)$. Since $x \overline{\in} X \setminus U(x) \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and X is (i,j)-regular, there is $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and so, $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \cap (Y \setminus U(x)) = \varnothing$. Since $\tau_j C \tau_i$, by Theorem 2 in [27], $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x)$ is a j-neighborhood of x, i.e., there is $E(x) \in \tau_j$ such that $E(x) \subset \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x)$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{E(x) : x \in X\}$ is a j-open covering of X, which refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$. Since Y is j-Lindelöff in X, there is a countable subfamily $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}' = \{E(x_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ such that $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$. For each $k = \overline{1,\infty}$ let $F_k = \bigcup\limits_{l<k} \tau_i \operatorname{cl} E(x_l)$ and $F_0 = \varnothing$. Then $F_k \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and if $W_k = U(x) \setminus F_k$, then $W_k \in \tau_i$ for each $k = \overline{1,\infty}$. Moreover, the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \{W_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$.

Hence, it remains to prove that $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ is j-locally finite at each point $y \in Y$. Let $y \in Y$ be any point. Since $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, let m be the smallest natural number $k \in N^+$ such that $y \in U(x_k)$, that is, $y \in U(x_m)$ and $y \overline{\in} U(x_l)$, i.e. $y \in (Y \setminus U(x_l))$ if $l < m$. Since $y \overline{\in} U(x_l)$ and $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} E(x_l) \subset \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x_l) \subset U(x_l)$, we obtain, that $y \overline{\in} \tau_j \operatorname{cl} E(x_l)$ for $l < m$. Moreover, since $\tau_i N \tau_j$ and $E(x) \in \tau_j$, we have $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} E(x_l) \subseteq \tau_j \operatorname{cl} E(x_l)$ and so $y \overline{\in} \tau_j \operatorname{cl} E(x_l)$ for $l < m$. Thus $y \overline{\in} F_m = \bigcup\limits_{l<m} \tau_j \operatorname{cl} E(x_l)$. Therefore, we obtain $y \in U(x_m) \setminus F_m = W_m \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ and thus $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$.

Finally, let $y \in Y$ be any point. Since $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$, there is $k \in N^+$ such that $y \in E(x_k)$. Then $E(x_k) \cap W_l = \varnothing$ for $l > k$. It follows that $E(x)$ is a j-open neighborhood of y, which intersects only finitely many elements of the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$. ☐

Definition 6.26. We will say that a BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i,j)-strongly quasi Lindelöff in X if for every covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} \subset \tau_i$ of Y there exists a countable subfamily $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ such that $Y \subset \tau_j \operatorname{cl} \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$.

It is clear that for a BsS $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ of a BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$, we have: Y is $(2,1)$-strongly quasi Lindelöff in X implies that Y is 1-strongly quasi Lindelöff in X and Y is 2-strongly quasi Lindelöff in X implies that Y is $(2,1)$-strongly quasi Lindelöff in X.

Theorem 6.27. *Let* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), $Y \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, *$Y$ be (j,i)-strongly quasi Lindelöff in X and Y be (i,j)-strongly paracompact in X. Then X is i-Lindelöff.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ be an i-open covering of X. Since Y is (i,j)-strongly paracompact in X, there is an i-open covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ of X which refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and such that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is j-locally finite at each point $y \in Y$. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ be the family of all j-open subsets of X which intersect only finitely many elements of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$. Clearly, $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ and since Y is (j,i)-strongly quasi Lindelöff in X, we can find a countable subfamily $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}} \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ such that $Y \subset \tau_i \operatorname{cl} \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}$. Furthermore, every set $U \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$, $U \neq \varnothing$ intersects at least one element of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}$. Indeed, if $U \cap V = \varnothing$ for each $V \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}$, then $U \cap (\cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}) = \varnothing$ and since $U \in \tau_i$, we have $U \cap \tau_i \operatorname{cl}(\cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}) = \varnothing$. But $Y \subset \tau_i \operatorname{cl} \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}$ and so $U \cap Y = \varnothing$ which is impossible since $Y \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$. On the other hand, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}$ is countable and every element of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}$ intersects only finitely many elements of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$. It follows that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is countable and thus Y is i-Lindeloff. □

Theorem 6.28. *If* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *is a* BsS *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$, $Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ *and Y is $(2,1)$-quasi paracompact in X, then Y is $(2,1)$-paracompact in X.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ be any 2-open covering of X, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'' = \{V_\alpha'' : \alpha \in D\} \subset \tau_2'$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, $Y = \bigcup\limits_\alpha V_\alpha''$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}''$ is 1-locally finite at each point of Y. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}' = \{V_\alpha' : \alpha \in D\} \subset \tau_2$ such that $V_\alpha' \cap Y = V_\alpha''$ for each $\alpha \in D$. Since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}''$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, for each V_α'' there is $U_\alpha \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ such that $V_\alpha'' \subset U_\alpha$. If $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{W_\alpha : W_\alpha = V_\alpha' \cap U_\alpha,\ \alpha \in D\}$, then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and $Y = \bigcup\limits_\alpha V_\alpha'' \subset \bigcup\limits_\alpha W_\alpha$. Hence, it remains to prove only that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is 1-locally finite at each point $x \in Y$. Contrary: there is a point $x_0 \in Y$ such that for each neighborhood $U(x_0) \in \tau_1$ we have $|\{W_\alpha : W_\alpha \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}},\ W_\alpha \cap U(x_0) \neq \varnothing\}| \geq \aleph_0$. Since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}''$ is 1-locally finite at x_0, there is $V(x_0) \in \tau_1$ such that $V(x_0)$ intersects only finitely many elements of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}''$. Hence, there is a finite set $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^n$ such that $V(x_0) \cap V_{\alpha_k}'' \neq \varnothing$ and $V(x_0) \cap V_\alpha'' = \varnothing$ if $\alpha \neq \alpha_k$. Let $\alpha \neq \alpha_k$ and $W_\alpha \cap V(x_0) \neq \varnothing$. The inclusion $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$ implies that $W_\alpha \cap V(x_0) \in \tau_2$ and since $Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, we have $W_\alpha \cap V(x_0) \cap Y \neq \varnothing$. On the other hand,

$$W_\alpha \cap V(x_0) \cap Y = V(x_0) \cap (V_\alpha' \cap U_\alpha \cap Y) = V(x_0) \cap V_\alpha'' = \varnothing$$

as $\alpha \neq \alpha_k$. A contradiction. Hence, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \subset \tau_2$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, $Y \subset \cup\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is 1-locally finite at each point $x \in Y$. Thus Y is $(2,1)$-paracompact in X. ☐

Theorem 6.29. *If* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *is* $(2,1)$*-paracompact in* $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *and* $(2,1)$*-free regular in* X*, then* Y *is* p*-normal in* X*.*

Proof. Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Since Y is $(2,1)$-free regular in X, for each point $a \in A$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(a) \in \tau_2$ and $U_a(B \cap Y) \in \tau_1$. Clearly, the family

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \big\{U(a) :\ a \in A\big\} \cup \{X \setminus A\}$$

is a 2-open covering of X as $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$. Since Y is $(2,1)$-paracompact in X, there is a family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \subset \tau_2$ such that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, $Y \subset \cup\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is 1-locally finite at each point $x \in Y$. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \big\{V \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} :\ V \cap A \neq \varnothing\big\}$ and $U = \cup\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \in \tau_2$. Then $A \cap Y \subset U$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ is also 1-locally finite at each point $x \in Y$. Hence, if $x \in Y$, then $x \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U$ if and only if $x \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V$ for some $V \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$. It is also obvious that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$. Moreover, since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \big\{V \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} :\ V \cap A \neq \varnothing\big\}$, for each $V \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ there is $U(a) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ such that $V \subset U(a)$. Since $U(a) \cap U_a(B \cap Y) = \varnothing$, $V \subset U(a)$ and $U_a(B\cap Y) \in \tau_1$, we have $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V \cap U_a(B\cap Y) = \varnothing$. Hence $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U \cap (B \cap Y) = \varnothing$. Let $W = X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U \in \tau_1$. Then $B \cap Y \subset W$, $A \cap Y \subset U$ and $U \cap W = \varnothing$. Thus Y is p-normal in X. ☐

Corollary 6.30. *If* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *is* $(2,1)$*-paracompact in a* $(2,1)$*-regular* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$*, then* Y *is* p*-normal in* X*.*

Proposition 6.31. *Let* (X, τ_1, τ_2) *be a* BS*. Then the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *If* $(Z, \tau_1'', \tau_2'') \subset (Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ *and* Y *is* (i,j)-R R*-paracompact, then* Z *is* (i,j)*-quasi paracompact in* X*.*

(2) *If* $(Y, \tau_1''', \tau_2''') \subset (Y_1, \tau_1'', \tau_2'') \subset (X_1, \tau_1', \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ *and* Y_1 *is* (i,j)*-quasi paracompact in* X_1*, then* Y *is* (i,j)*-quasi paracompact in* X*.*

Proof. (1) Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ be any i-open covering of X. Then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} \cap Y = \big\{U \cap Y :\ U \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}\big\}$ is an i-open covering of Y and, hence, there is a i-open covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ of Y such that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is j-locally finite at each point of Y. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \cap Z$ is an i-open covering of Z, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \cap Z$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \cap Z$ is j-locally finite at each point of Z and thus Z is (i,j)-quasi paracompact in X.

(2) Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ be any i-open covering of X. Then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} \cap X_1 = \big\{U \cap X_1 :\ U \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}\big\}$ is an i-open covering of X_1. Since Y_1 is (i,j)-quasi paracompact in X_1, one can find a covering $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ of Y_1 by i-open in Y_1 sets which refines

$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} \cap X_1$ and so – $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, and which is j-locally finite at each point of Y_1. It is clear, that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \cap Y = \{V \cap Y : \ V \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}\}$ is a covering of Y by i-open in Y sets, j-locally finite at each point of Y and since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} \cap X_1$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \cap Y$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, that is, Y is (i, j)-quasi paracompact in X. ☐

Theorem 6.32. *Let* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *be a* BsS *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$. *Then the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *If* X *is* 1-T$_2$ *and* Y *is* $(2,1)$*-quasi paracompact in* X*, then* Y *is* $(1,2)$*-regular.*
(2) *If* X *is* 1-T$_2$ *and* Y *is* $(2,1)$*-paracompact in* X*, then* Y *is* $(1,2)$*-regular in* X*.*
(3) *If* Y *is* $(2,1)$*-quasi paracompact in* X *and* $(2,1)$*-free regular in* X*, then* Y *is* p*-quasi normal in* X*.*

Proof. (1) Let $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ and $x \overline{\in} F$. Then $x \overline{\in} \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$. Since X is 1-T$_2$, it is p-T$_2$ and so for each point $y \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} F$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U_y(x) \in \tau_1$ and $U_x(y) \in \tau_2$. Clearly,

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \big\{U_x(y) : \ y \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} F\big\} \cup \big\{X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} F\big\}$$

is a 2-open covering of X as $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$. Since X is $(2,1)$-quasi paracompact in X, there is a family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{V\} \subset \tau_2'$ such that $Y = \cup\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is 1-locally finite at each point of Y. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \big\{V' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} : \ V' \cap F \neq \varnothing\big\}$ and $U = \cup\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$. Then it is clear that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ is 1-locally finite at each point $y \in Y$, so that $t \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U$ if and only if there is $V' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ such that $t \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V'$. Since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \{V' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} : \ V' \cap F \neq \varnothing\}$, for each $V' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ there is $U_x(y) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ such that $V' \subset U_x(y)$. Since $U_x(y) \cap U_y(x) = \varnothing$ for such $U_x(y)$ and the corresponding $U_y(x) \in \tau_1$, we have $x \overline{\in} \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V'$ for each $V' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$. Since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ is 1-locally finite at each point of Y, we have $x \overline{\in} \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U$. Clearly, $x \in X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U = W' \in \tau_1$ and so $W' \cap Y = W \in \tau_1'$, $F \subset U \in \tau_2'$, where $U \cap W = \varnothing$. Thus Y is $(1,2)$-regular.

(2) Let $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $x \overline{\in} F$. Then for each point $y \in F$, there are disjoint neighborhoods $U_y(x) \in \tau_1$ and $U_x(y) \in \tau_2$. The family

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \big\{U_x(y) : \ y \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} F\big\} \cup \{X \setminus F\}$$

is a 2-open covering of X as $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$. Since Y is $(2,1)$-paracompact in X, there is a family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{V\} \subset \tau_2$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, $Y \subset \cup\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is 1-locally finite at each point of Y. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \big\{V \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} : \ V \cap F \neq \varnothing\big\}$ and $U = \cup\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \in \tau_2$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ is 1-locally finite at each point of Y. Hence for each $t \in Y$, $t \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U$ if and only if $t \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V$ for some $V \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$. For each $V \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ there is $U_x(y) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ such that $V \subset U_x(y)$. Since $U_x(y) \cap U_y(x) = \varnothing$ and each $U_y(x) \in \tau_1$, we have $x \overline{\in} \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V$ for each $V \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$. Since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ is 1-locally finite, $x \overline{\in} \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U$.

Clearly, $x \in X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U = W \in \tau_1$, $F \cap Y \subset U$ and $W \cap U = \varnothing$. Thus Y is $(1,2)$-regular in X.

(3) Let $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Since Y is $(2,1)$-free regular in X, for each point $a \in A$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U(a) \in \tau_2$ and $U_a(B \cap Y) \in \tau_1$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{U(a) : a \in A\} \cup \{X \setminus A\}$ is a 2-open covering of X as $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$. Since Y is $(2,1)$-quasi paracompact in X, there is a family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{V'\} \subset \tau'_2$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, $Y = \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is 1-locally finite at each point of Y. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \{V' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} : V' \cap A \neq \varnothing\}$ and $U = \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \in \tau'_2$. Then $A \cap Y \subset U$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ is 1-locally finite at each point of Y. Hence, if $x \in Y$, then

$$x \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U \ \text{ if and only if } \ x \in \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V' \ \text{ for some } \ V' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \qquad (*)$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$. Moreover, since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \{V' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} : V' \cap A \neq \varnothing\}$, for each $V' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ there is $a \in A$ such that $V' \subset U(a)$. Since $U(a) \cap U_a(B \cap Y) = \varnothing$ for such $U(a)$ and $V' \subset U(a)$ we have $V' \cap U_a(B \cap Y) = \varnothing$. Hence

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V' \cap U_a(B \cap Y) = \varnothing \ \text{ for each } \ V' \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$$

since $U_a(B \cap Y) \in \tau_1$. By $(*)$, $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U \cap (B \cap Y) = \varnothing$. Let

$$W' = X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} U \in \tau_1 \ \text{ and } \ W = W' \cap Y \in \tau'_1.$$

Then

$$A \cap Y \subset U \in \tau'_2, \quad B \cap Y \subset W \in \tau'_1$$

and $U \cap W = \varnothing$. Thus Y is p-quasi normal in X. □

Definition 6.33. We will say that a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) has an (i,j)-strong paracompactness property if for every set $F \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i$, $\varnothing \neq F \neq X$, and every family of sets $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{U_\alpha : \alpha \in A\} \subset \tau_j$ such that $F \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ there is an i-locally finite family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{V_\beta : \beta \in B\} \subset \tau_j$ such that $F \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$.

Proposition 6.34. *Every p-Hausdorff* BS *having a p-strong paracompactness property, is p-regular.*

Proof. Let $a \in X$, $F \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i$ and $a \overline{\in} F$. Then for each point $x \in F$ there are disjoint sets $U_x(a) \in \tau_i$ and $U_a(x) \in \tau_j$. Hence,

$$U_x(a) \cap \tau_i \operatorname{cl} U_a(x) = \varnothing \ \text{ for each } \ x \in F.$$

Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{U_a(x) : x \in F\} \subset \tau_j$ and by condition there is a family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{V_\alpha : \alpha \in A\} \subset \tau_j$ such that $F \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is i-locally finite. Hence, for each $\alpha \in A$ there is $x \in F$ such that

$$V_\alpha \subset U_a(x) \subset X \setminus U_x(a) = \tau_i \operatorname{cl}(X \setminus U_x(a)) \subset X \setminus \{a\}.$$

Therefore, $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} V_\alpha \subset \tau_i \operatorname{cl} U_a(x) \subset X \setminus \{a\}$, for each $\alpha \in A$. Since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is i-locally finite, $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in A} V_\alpha = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in A} \tau_i \operatorname{cl} V_\alpha$ and hence,

$$\tau_i \operatorname{cl} \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} V_\alpha = \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} \tau_i \operatorname{cl} V_\alpha \subset X \setminus \{a\}.$$

Let $U(a) = X \setminus \tau_i \operatorname{cl} \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in A} V_\alpha \in \tau_i$ and $U(F) = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in A} V_\alpha \in \tau_j$. Then $U(a) \cap U(F) = \varnothing$ and thus X is p-regular. $\square$

Proposition 6.35. *Every* $(1,2)$*-regular* BS *having the* $(2,1)$*-strong paracompactness property or every* $(2,1)$*-regular* BS *having the* $(1,2)$*-strong paracompactness property, is p-normal.*

Proof. For example, let us prove the first case. Let $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_2$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Since X is $(1,2)$-regular, for each $x \in B$ there are disjoint neighborhoods $U_x(A) \in \tau_2$ and $U_A(x) \in \tau_1$. Hence

$$U_x(A) \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_A(x) = \varnothing.$$

Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \big\{U_A(x) : \ x \in B\big\} \subset \tau_1$ is a 1-open covering of B and since X has a $(2,1)$-strong paracompactness property, there is family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{V_\alpha : \ \alpha \in D\} \subset \tau_1$ such that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is 2-locally finite, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and $B \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$. Clearly, for each $\alpha \in D$ there is $x \in B$ such that

$$V_\alpha \subset U_A(x) \subset X \setminus U_x(A) = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(X \setminus U_x(A)) \subset X \setminus A.$$

Hence

$$\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V_\alpha \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U_A(x) \subset X \setminus A \ \text{ for each } \ \alpha \in D.$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is 2-locally finite, we have

$$\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} V_\alpha = \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V_\alpha$$

and, therefore,

$$\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} V_\alpha = \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V_\alpha \subset X \setminus A.$$

Let $U(A) = X \setminus \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in D} V_\alpha$ and $U(B) = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha \in D} V_\alpha$. Then $U(A) \in \tau_2$, $U(B) \in \tau_1$ and $U(A) \cap U(B) = \varnothing$. Thus, X is p-normal. $\square$

Definition 6.36. A BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) is (i,j)-strongly pseudocompact in X if every family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \big\{U_\alpha : \ \alpha \in D\big\} \subset \tau_i$ such that $U_\alpha \cap Y \neq \varnothing$ for each $\alpha \in D$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ is j-locally finite at each point of Y, is finite.

For a BsS $(Y, \tau'_1 < \tau'_2)$ of a BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$, we have: Y is $(1,2)$-strongly pseudocompact in X implies that Y is 1-strongly pseudocompact in X and Y is 2-strongly pseudocompact in X implies that Y is $(2,1)$-strongly pseudocompact in X.

Proposition 6.37. *If* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), Y *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* X *and* (i,j)*-paracompact in* X*, then* Y *is* i*-compcat in* X*.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ be an arbitrary i-open covering of X. Since Y is (i,j)-paracompact in X, there is a family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \subset \tau_i$ such that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, $Y \subset \cup \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is j-locally finite at each point of Y. We may also assume that $U \cap Y \neq \varnothing$ for each set $U \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$. Since Y is (i,j)-strongly pseudocompact in X, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is finite and so, Y is i-compact in X. ☐

Corollary 6.38. *If* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is a* BsS *of an* (i,j)*-regular* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), $\tau_j C \tau_i$, $\tau_i N \tau_j$, Y *is* j*-Lindelöff in* X *and* Y *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* X*, then* X *is* i*-compact.*

Proof. By Theorem 6.25, Y is (i,j)-paracompact in X and it remains to use Proposition 6.37. ☐

Corollary 6.39. *If* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* X *and* (i,j)*-paracompact in* X*, where* X *is* i*-regular, then* $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} Y$ *is* i*-compact.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.37, Y is i-compact in X. Since X is i-regular, by [19], $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} Y$ is i-compact. ☐

Corollary 6.40. *If* (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* i*-regular,* (i,j)*-regular,* $\tau_j C \tau_i$, $\tau_i N \tau_j$, Y *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* X *and* Y *is* j*-Lindelöff in* X*, then* $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} Y$ *is* i*-compact*

Proof. Indeed, by Theorem 6.25, Y is (i,j)-paracompact in X and hence, it remains, to use Corollary 6.39. ☐

Corollary 6.41. *Let* $(Y, \tau'_1 < \tau'_2)$ *is* 2*-Lindelöff in* $(X, \tau_1 <_N \tau_2)$, Y *is* $(1,2)$*-strongly pseudocompact in* X *and* X *is* 1*-regular, then* $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y$ *is* 1*-compact.*

Proof. Indeed, since $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$, we have $\tau_2 C \tau_1$ and X is 1-regular implies that X is $(1,2)$-regular. Hence, by Theorem 6.25 for $i = 1$, $j = 2$, we have that Y is $(1,2)$-paracompact in X. Therefore, by Corollary 6.39, $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} Y$ is 1-compact. ☐

Theorem 6.42. *For a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *If* (Y,τ_1'',τ_2'') *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* X*, then* $(\tau_i \operatorname{cl} Y,\tau_1',\tau_2')$ *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* X *too.*

(2) *If* $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'')\subset(Y,\tau_1',\tau_2')\subset(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ *and* Z *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* Y*, then* Z *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* X *as well. Moreover, if* $Y\in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$*, then* Z *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* Y *if and only if* Z *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* X*.*

(3) *If* (Z,τ_1'',τ_2'') *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* X*, then there is a* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of* X *such that* $Y\in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$*,* $Z\subset Y$*,* $Z\in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ *and* Z *is* (i,j)*-strongly pseudocompact in* Y*.*

Proof. (1) Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}=\{U_\alpha:\ \alpha\in A\}\subset\tau_i$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ be j-locally finite at each point of $\tau_i\operatorname{cl}Y$ and $U_\alpha\cap\tau_i\operatorname{cl}Y\neq\varnothing$ for each $\alpha\in A$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ is also j-locally finite at each point of Y and since $Y\in\tau_i$, $U_\alpha\cap\tau_i\operatorname{cl}Y\neq\varnothing$ implies that $U_\alpha\cap Y\neq\varnothing$ for each $\alpha\in A$. But Y is (i,j)-strongly pseudocompact in X and so $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ is finite.

(2) First, let Z be (i,j)-strongly pseudocompact in Y, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}=\{U_\alpha:\ \alpha\in A\}\subset\tau_i$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ be j-locally finite at each point of Z and $U_\alpha\cap Z\neq\varnothing$ for each $\alpha\in A$. Let us consider the family

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}'=\bigl\{U_\alpha'=U_\alpha\cap Y:\ \alpha\in A\bigr\}\subset\tau_i'.$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ is j-locally finite at each point of Z, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}'$ is also j-locally finite at each point of Z. Moreover, $Z\subset Y$ gives

$$U_\alpha'\cap Z=(U_\alpha\cap Y)\cap Z=U_\alpha\cap Z\neq\varnothing\ \text{ for each }\ \alpha\in A.$$

Since Z is (i,j)-strongly pseudocompact in Y, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}'$ is finite and thus, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ is finite a well. Hence, Z is (i,j)-pseudocompact in X.

Now, let $Y\in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ and Z be (i,j)-strongly pseudocompact in X. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'=\bigl\{U_\alpha':\ \alpha\in A\bigr\}\subset\tau_i'$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$ be j-locally finite at each point of Z and $U_\alpha'\cap Z\neq\varnothing$ for each $\alpha\in A$. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}=\bigl\{U_\alpha:\ U_\alpha\cap Y=U_\alpha'\bigr\}\subset\tau_i$. Clearly,

$$U_\alpha\cap Z=(U_\alpha\cap Y)\cap Z=U_\alpha'\cap Z\neq\varnothing\ \text{ for each }\ \alpha\in A.$$

Let us show that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is j-locally finite at each point of Z. Contrary: there is $z\in Z$ such that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is not j-locally finite at z. Hence, for each neighborhood $U(z)\in\tau_j$ we have

$$\Bigl|\bigl\{U_\alpha:\ U_\alpha\in\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}},\ U_\alpha\cap U(z)\neq\varnothing\bigr\}\Bigr|\geq\aleph_0.$$

Since $Y\in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, for each $U\in\tau_i\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ we have $U\cap Y\neq\varnothing$ and so, if

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}=\bigl\{U_\alpha\in\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}:\ U_\alpha\cap U(z)\neq\varnothing\bigr\},$$

then $U_\alpha\cap Y\neq\varnothing$ for each $U_\alpha\in\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$. Since $Z\subset Y$, we have $U_\alpha'\cap U(z)\neq\varnothing$ for each $U_\alpha'\in\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}'$, where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}'=\{U_\alpha'=U_\alpha\cap Y:\ U_\alpha\in\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}\}$. Hence

$|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}'| \geq \aleph_0$ which is impossible. Therefore, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is j-locally finite at each point of Z and since Z is (i,j)-strongly pseudocompact in X, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ is finite. Hence $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}'$ is also finite and thus, Z is (i,j)-strongly pseudocompact in Y.

(3) Let $Y = X \setminus (\tau_i \operatorname{cl} Z \setminus Z)$. Then

$$\tau_i \operatorname{cl} Y = \tau_i\big((X \setminus \tau_i \operatorname{cl} Z) \cup Z\big) = X$$

and $Z \subset Y$. Hence, by the second part of (2), Z is (i,j)-strongly pseudocompact in Y. Finally,

$$\tau_i \operatorname{cl} Z \cap Y = \tau_i \operatorname{cl} Z \cap \big((X \setminus \tau_i \operatorname{cl} Z) \cup Z\big) = Z$$

and so $Z \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i'$. □

The next five sections are devoted to introducing and studying of the relative bitopological inductive and covering dimension functions, their interrelations and also, to the new inductive and relative inductive dimension functions, the so called separately inductive dimension functions. Note also here that the relative bitopological inductive dimension functions will be characterized in two different ways: as in terms of neighborhoods so by means of partitions. Relative topological dimension functions have been considered in [5], [23], [24], [26].

7. (i,j)-Small Relative Inductive Dimension Functions

Definition 7.1. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) and n denote a nonnegative integer. We say that:

(1) (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) = -1$ if and only if $Y = \varnothing$.

(2) (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq n$ if for each point $y \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(y) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(y) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(y) \subset U(y)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(y) \cap Y, X\big) \leq n-1.$$

(3) (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) = n$ if (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq n$ and the inequality (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq n-1$ does not hold.

(4) (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) = \infty$ if the inequality (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq n$ does not hold for any n.

As a rule,

$$p\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq n \Longleftrightarrow \big((1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq n \wedge (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq n\big).$$

Recall also here that the small relative inductive dimension was introduced by V. V. Filippov.

From the our point of view this fact is motivated by the well-known topological lemma, following which for a TsS (Y,τ') of a hereditarily normal TS (X,τ) we have $\operatorname{ind} Y \leq n$ if and only if for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau$ such that $\tau \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and $\operatorname{ind}(\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y) \leq n-1$, and is confirmed by Proposition 1 in [23] which says that for any TsS (Y,τ') of a hereditarily normal TS (X,τ) take place the equality $\operatorname{ind} Y = \operatorname{ind}(Y,X)$.

Remark 7.2. Let us show that for any subset $Y \subset X$ and any nonnegative integer n we have: (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq n$ if and only if for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \ \text{ and } \ (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y\big) \leq n-1 \qquad (*)$$

in the sense of (1) of Corollary 3.1.6 in [8].

We shall prove this equivalence by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)$-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X)$.

Indeed, by (1) and (2) of Definition 7.1 and (1) of Definition 3.1.3 in [8], for $n=0$ we have: (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq 0 \Longleftrightarrow \big($for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}((j,i)$-$\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y, X) = -1\big) \Longleftrightarrow \big($for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and (j,i)-$\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y = \varnothing\big) \Longleftrightarrow \big($for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}((j,i)$-$\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y) = -1\big)$.

Now, suppose that for any subset $Y \subset X$ the equivalences: (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq k \Longleftrightarrow \big($for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}((j,i)$-$\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y, X) \leq k-1\big) \Longleftrightarrow \big($for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y\big) \leq k-1\big) \qquad (**)$$

are proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove they for $n=k$.

Once more applying (2) of Definition 7.1 we obtain: (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) = k \Longleftrightarrow \big($for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}((j,i)$-$\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y, X) \leq k-1\big)$.

Since $(**)$ holds for any subset $Y \subset X$, by inductive hypothesis the equivalence $(*)$ is proved.

Hence, it should be noted, that the definitions of relative inductive functions $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)$ given in Remark 7.2, are generalizations of the topological lemma, mentioned before Remark 7.2.

Theorem 7.3. *If* (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *is a* BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2), *then the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,Y \le (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \le (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,X$.

(2) $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(X,X) = (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,X$.

(3) *If* $Z \subset Y$, *then*

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Z,Y) \le (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Z,X) \le (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X).$$

Moreover, if $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$, *then*

(4) $(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,Y \le (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \le (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,X \le 1\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,X$ *and*

$$2\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,Y \le (2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,Y \le (2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \le (2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,X.$$

Proof. (1) First, let us prove the left inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)$. Suppose that the inequality is proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Y$ be any point and $U'(x) \in \tau_i'$ be any neighborhood. If $U(x) \cap Y = U'(x)$, then by $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) = k$ there exists $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \le k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive assumption, $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y\big) \le k-1$. Moreover, $\tau_j' \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U'(x)$ for $V'(x) = V(x) \cap Y$ and since

$$(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x) \subseteq (j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y,$$

by the monotonicity, i.e., by (2) of Proposition 3.1.4 in [8],

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x) \le k-1.$$

Therefore, by (1) of Corollary 3.1.6 in [8] $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,Y \le k$ and so $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,Y \le (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)$.

Now, let us prove the right inequality by induction under $n = (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,X$. Suppose that the inequality is proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Y \subset X$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Then by (1) of Corollary 3.1.6 in [8] there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \le k-1$. Hence, by inductive assumption

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, (j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x)\big) \le k-1$$

and by the left inequality

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y\big) \le k-1.$$

Thus, by Remark 7.2, (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \le k$ and so (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \le (i,j)$-$\operatorname{ind} X$.

(2) The equality follows directly from (1) for $Y = X$.

(3) First, let us prove the right inequality, i.e.,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Z,X) \le (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Y,X)$$

(**the monotonicity property of the (i,j)-small relative inductive dimensions**).

Let $n = (i,j)$-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X)$, the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. If $x \in Z$ is any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ is any neighborhood, then $x \in Z \subset Y$ and (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) = k$ imply that there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subseteq U(x)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \le k-1.$$

Since $Z \subset Y$, we have

$$(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Z \subseteq (j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y$$

and by inductive assumption,

$$\begin{gathered}(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Z, X\big) \le \\ \le (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \le k-1.\end{gathered}$$

Thus (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,X) \le k$ and so (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,X) \le (i,j)$-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X)$.

Now, let us prove the left inequality by induction under $n = (i,j)$-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Z$ be any point and $U'(x) \in \tau'_i$ be any neighborhood. Since $x \in Z \subset Y$ and (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,X) = k$, for $U(x) \in \tau_i$, where $U(x) \cap Y = U'(x)$, there is $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subseteq U(x)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Z, X\big) \le k-1.$$

If $V'(x) = V(x) \cap Y$, then $\tau'_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U'(x)$. Since

$$(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \subseteq (j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y$$

and $Z \subset Y$, we have

$$(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z \subseteq (j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Z.$$

Hence, by the right inequality,

$$\begin{gathered}(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z, X\big) \le \\ \le (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Z, X\big) \le k-1. \qquad (*)\end{gathered}$$

Therefore, by the inductive hypothesis and $(*)$,

$$\begin{gathered}(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z, Y\big) \le \\ \le (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z, X\big) \le k-1.\end{gathered}$$

Thus, (i,j)-ind$(Z,Y) \leq k$ and so (i,j)-ind$(Z,Y) \leq (i,j)$-ind(Z,X).

(4) Finally, for the case $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$ it suffices to use (1) above and (1) of Theorem 3.1.36 in [8]. ☐

Theorem 7.4. *For an i-open* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of an (i,j)-regular* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *If $p\text{-cl}\, Z \subseteq Y$, then (i,j)-ind$(Z,X) = (i,j)$-ind(Z,Y).*

(2) *(i,j)-ind$(Y,X) = (i,j)$-ind$\,Y$.*

Proof. (1) By (3) of Theorem 7.3, it suffices to prove the inequality (i,j)-ind$(Z,X) \leq (i,j)$-ind(Z,Y). We shall use the induction under $n = (i,j)$-ind(Z,Y). Suppose that the inequality is proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Z$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. As $Y \in \tau_i$, one can assume that $U(x) \subset Y$. Since X is (i,j)-regular and (i,j)-ind$(Z,Y) = k$, there is $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V(x) \cap Z, Y\big) \leq k-1.$$

Clearly,

$$p\text{-cl}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V(x) \cap Z\big) \subseteq p\text{-cl}\, Z \subseteq Y$$

and so, one can use the inductive assumption under the set (j,i)-$\text{Fr}_Y\, V(x) \cap Z$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}(i,j)\text{-ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V(x) \cap Z, X\big) &\leq \\ \leq (i,j)\text{-ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V(x) \cap Z, Y\big) &\leq k-1.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \subset Y$ and hence,

$$(j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V(x) = (j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(x),$$

we have

$$(i,j)\text{-ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Z, X\big) \leq k-1$$

so that (i,j)-ind$(Z,X) \leq k$. Thus (i,j)-ind$(Z,X) \leq (i,j)$-ind(Z,Y).

(2) By (1) of Theorem 7.3, it suffices to prove the inequality (i,j)-ind$(Y,X) \leq (i,j)$-ind$\,Y$, where (i,j)-ind$\,Y = n$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Y$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. But $Y \in \tau_i$ and one can assume that $U(x) \subset Y$. Since X is (i,j)-regular and (i,j)-ind$\,Y = k$, there is $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \subset Y$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-ind}(j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V(x) = (i,j)\text{-ind}(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(x) \leq k-1.$$

But (i,j)-ind$\,Y = (i,j)$-ind(Y,Y) and one can suppose that

$$(i,j)\text{-ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, Y\big) \leq k-1,$$

where $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y\subset Y$ and so

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x),Y\big)\leq k-1.$$

Since

$$p\text{-}\mathrm{cl}(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)=(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\subset Y,$$

one can consider in (1) the set $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)$ instead of Z, and so

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y,X\big)=(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x),X\big)=$$
$$=(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x),Y\big)\leq k-1.$$

Therefore $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)\leq k$ and thus $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)\leq(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,Y$. □

Proposition 7.5. *If* (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *is a* BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *and* $Y=Y_1\cup Y_2$*, then*

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)\leq(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_1,X)+(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_2,X)+1.$$

Proof. We shall use the induction under

$$n=(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_1,X)+(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_2,X).$$

Let the inequality be proved for $n\leq k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. Without loss of generality let $x\in Y_1\subset Y$. Then for any neighborhood $U(x)\in\tau_i$ there is $V(x)\in\tau_i$ such that $\tau_j\,\mathrm{cl}\,V(x)\subset U(x)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y_1,X\big)\leq(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_1,X)-1.$$

Since

$$(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y=\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y_1\big)\cup\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y_2\big)$$

and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y_1,X\big)+$$
$$+(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y_2,X\big)\leq$$
$$\leq(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_1,X)-1+(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_2,X)=k-1,$$

one can use the induction under the set $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y$. Hence,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y,X\big)\leq k-1+1=k$$

and so $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)\leq k+1$. □

Proposition 7.6. *For any* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of a hereditarily p-normal* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *we have* $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)=(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,Y$.

Proof. First, let us prove that if $U'\in\tau_i'$, then there is $U\in\tau_i$ such that $U\cap Y=U'$ and $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X U\cap Y=(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y U'$. Indeed, for the sets U' and $Y\setminus\tau_j'\,\mathrm{cl}\,U'$ we have:

$$\big(\tau_j\,\mathrm{cl}\,U'\cap(Y\setminus\tau_j'\,\mathrm{cl}\,U')\big)\cup\big(U'\cap\tau_i\,\mathrm{cl}(Y\setminus\tau_j'\,\mathrm{cl}\,U')\big)=\varnothing$$

and by (5) of Definition 1.1, there are $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $U' \subset U$, $Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U' \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. Hence $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U \cap (Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U') = \varnothing$, i.e., $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U \cap Y = \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U'$ and so

$$(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, U \cap Y = (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U \setminus U) \cap Y = \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U' \setminus U' = (j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, U'.$$

Evidently by (1) of Theorem 7.3, it suffices to prove that $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \le (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, Y$. Let $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, Y = n$, the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Y$ and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Since $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, Y = n$, there is $V'(x) \in \tau'_i$ such that $\tau'_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U(x) \cap Y$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x)\big) \le k-1$. But, by the first part of the proof, there is $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $V(x) \cap Y = V'(x)$, $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x) = (j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y$ and so

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y\big) \le k-1.$$

Hence, by the inductive assumption,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \le$$
$$\le (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y\big) \le k-1$$

so that $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \le k$ and thus $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \le (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, Y$. □

Proposition 7.7. *If (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is a p-perfectly normal* BsS *of a p-normal* BS *(X, τ_1, τ_2) and $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, then $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) = (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, Y$.*

Proof. By Proposition 7.6 it suffices to prove that if $U' \in \tau'_i$, then there is $U \in \tau_i$ such that $U \cap Y = U'$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, U \cap Y = (j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, U'$. Since (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) is p-perfectly normal and $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, we have

$$U' \in j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y) \subset j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X), \quad Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U' \in i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y) \subset i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X),$$
$$\tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U' = \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U' \ \text{ and } \ \tau'_i \operatorname{cl}(Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U') = \tau_i \operatorname{cl}(Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U').$$

Hence

$$\big(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U' \cap (Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U')\big) \cup \big(U' \cap \tau_i \operatorname{cl}(Y \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U')\big) = \varnothing. \qquad (*)$$

Since (X, τ_1, τ_2) is p-normal, $U' \in j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$, $Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U' \in i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$ and $(*)$ is satisfied, by Lemma 2.21, there are $U \in \tau_i$, $V \in \tau_j$ such that $U' \subset U$, $Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U' \subset V$ and $U \cap V = \varnothing$. Clearly, $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U \cap (Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U') = \varnothing$ and hence, $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U \cap Y = \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U'$. Thus,

$$(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, U \cap Y = (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U \setminus U) \cap Y = \tau'_j \operatorname{cl} U' \setminus U' = (j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, U'.$$

Therefore, it remains to use the second part of the proof of Proposition 7.6. □

Theorem 7.8. *If $f : (X, \tau_1 < \tau_2) \to (X_1, \gamma_1 < \gamma_2)$ is a d-continuous surjection and $(Y, \tau'_1 < \tau'_2)$ is a* BsS *of X such that the restriction*

$f\big|_Y : (Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2') \to (Y_1 = f(Y), \gamma_1' < \gamma_2')$ is a d-homeomorphism, then $(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_1,X_1)$. Moreover, if (X_1,γ_1,γ_2) is hereditarily p-normal, then

$$(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) = (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_1,X_1) = (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\,Y.$$

Proof. First, let us prove the inequality $(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_1,X_1)$ by induction under $n = (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_1,X_1)$. Suppose that the inequality is proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Y$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_1$ be any neighborhood. Since $f\big|_Y$ is a d-homeomorphism, we have $f(U(x) \cap Y) \in \gamma_1'$. Furthermore, since $(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_1,X_1) = k$, for a set $U \in \gamma_1$, where $U \cap Y_1 = f(U(x) \cap Y)$, there is $W \in \gamma_1$ such that $\gamma_2\,\mathrm{cl}\,W \subset U$ and

$$(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W \cap Y_1, X_1\big) \leq k-1.$$

Let $V(x) = f^{-1}(W) \cap U(x) \in \tau_1$ and let us prove that $(2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y \subseteq f^{-1}((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W) \cap Y$.

Indeed,

$$\begin{gathered}(2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) = (2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X \big(f^{-1}(W) \cap U(x)\big) = \\ = \big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X f^{-1}(W) \cap (2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X U(x)\big) \cup \\ \cup \big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X f^{-1}(W) \cap U(x)\big) \cup \big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X U(x) \cap f^{-1}(W)\big),\end{gathered}$$

as $(2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) = 2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)$ for $V(x) \in \tau_1 \subset \tau_2$. Since $W \cap Y_1 \subseteq U \cap Y_1 = f(U(x) \cap Y)$, it is evident that $\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X U(x) \cap f^{-1}(W)\big) \cap Y = \varnothing$ so that

$$\begin{gathered}\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X f^{-1}(W) \cap (2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X U(x)\big) \cup \\ \cup \big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X f^{-1}(W) \cap U(x)\big) \subseteq \\ \subseteq (2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X f^{-1}(W) \subseteq f^{-1}\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W\big).\end{gathered}$$

Therefore

$$(2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y \subseteq f^{-1}\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W\big) \cap Y = f^{-1}\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W \cap Y_1\big)$$

and so

$$f\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y\big) \subset f\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\big) \cap Y_1 \subset (2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W \cap Y_1.$$

Hence, by inductive assumption and (3) of Theorem 7.3,

$$\begin{gathered}(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \leq \\ \leq (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big(f\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y\big), X_1\big) \leq \\ \leq (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W \cap Y_1, X_1\big) \leq k-1,\end{gathered}$$

so that, $(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \leq k$. Thus $(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y_1,X_1)$.

For the second part, first of all note that $f\big|_Y : (Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2') \to (Y_1 = f(Y), \gamma_1' < \gamma_2')$ is a d-homeomorphism implies that $(1,2)\text{-ind}\, Y = (1,2)\text{-ind}\, Y_1$. On the other hand, since $(X_1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is hereditarily p-normal, by Proposition 7.6, $(1,2)\text{-ind}(Y_1, X_1) = (1,2)\text{-ind}\, Y_1$. Hence, by (1) of Theorem 7.3, it suffices to prove only that $(1,2)\text{-ind}(Y, X) \le (1,2)\text{-ind}\, Y$. Let $(1,2)\text{-ind}\, Y = n$, the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. If $x \in Y$ is any point and $U(x) \in \tau_1$ is any neighborhood, then there is $V'(x) \in \tau_1'$ such that $\tau_2' \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subseteq U(x) \cap Y$ and $(1,2)\text{-ind}\big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(x)\big) \le k-1$. Since $f\big|_Y$ is a d-homeomorphism, we have $f(V'(x)) \in \gamma_1'$ and since $(X_1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is hereditarily p-normal, by the proof of first part of Proposition 7.6, there is $W \in \gamma_1$ such that

$$W \cap Y_1 = f(V'(x)) \ \text{ and } \ (2,1)\text{-Fr}_{X_1} W \cap Y_1 = (2,1)\text{-Fr}_{Y_1} f(V'(x)).$$

Let $V(x) = f^{-1}(W) \cap U(x)$. Then $V(x) \in \tau_1$ and $V(x) \cap Y = V'(x)$. Let us prove that $(2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y = (2,1)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(x)$. First, let us show that

$$(2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, f^{-1}(W) \subseteq f^{-1}\big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_{X_1} W\big).$$

Indeed, let

$$x \in (2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, f^{-1}(W) = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} f^{-1}(W) \setminus f^{-1}(W).$$

Then $f(x) \in f(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} f^{-1}(W))$ and $f(x) \overline{\in} W$. Since f is d-continuous, it is 2-continuous and so

$$f\big(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} f^{-1}(W)\big) \subset \gamma_2 \operatorname{cl}\big(f f^{-1}(W)\big) = \gamma_2 \operatorname{cl} W.$$

Therefore,

$$f(x) \in \gamma_2 \operatorname{cl} W \setminus W = (2,1)\text{-Fr}_{X_1} W$$

so that $x \in f^{-1}((2,1)\text{-Fr}_{X_1} W)$.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}(2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, f^{-1}(W) \cap Y &\subseteq f^{-1}\big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_{X_1} W\big) \cap Y \subseteq \\ &\subseteq f^{-1}\big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_{X_1} W \cap Y_1\big) \cap Y = \\ &= f^{-1}\big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_{Y_1} f(V'(x)) \cap Y = (2,1)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(x).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}(2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(x) &= \big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, U(x) \cap (2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, f^{-1}(W)\big) \cup \\ &\cup \big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, U(x) \cap f^{-1}(W)\big) \cup \big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, f^{-1}(W) \cap U(x)\big)\end{aligned}$$

and so $(2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y = (2,1)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(x)$. Therefore, it remains to use the inductive assumption with respect to $(2,1)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(x)$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}(1,2)\text{-ind}\big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X\big) &= (1,2)\text{-ind}\big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(x), X\big) \le \\ &\le (1,2)\text{-ind}\big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(x)\big) \le k-1.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $(1,2)$-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq k$ and thus, $(1,2)$-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) \leq (1,2)$-$\operatorname{ind} Y$. ☐

Proposition 7.9. *If* $(X, \tau_1 <_S \tau_2)$ *is* (i,j)*-regular,* $Y \in 2$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$ *and* $Z \subset Y \subset X$*, then* (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,Y) = (i,j)$-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,X)$.

Proof. By (3) of Theorem 7.3, it suffices to prove that

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Z,X) \leq (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Z,Y)$$

by induction under $n = (i,j)$-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,Y)$. Suppose that the inequality is proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Z$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Since (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,Y) = k$, there is $V'(x) \in \tau'_i$ in (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) such that $\tau'_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U(x) \cap Y$ and (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z, Y\big) \leq k-1$. Furthermore, by inductive hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{gathered}(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z, X\big) \leq \\ \leq (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z, Y\big) \leq k-1.\end{gathered}$$

Let $W(x) \in \tau_i$ and $W(x) \cap Y = V'(x)$. Since $V'(x) \subset U(x)$, for $V(x) = W(x) \cap U(x) \in \tau_i$ we have $V(x) \subset U(x)$ and $V(x) \cap Y = V'(x)$. By $Y \in 2$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$, $V(x) \cap Y = V'(x)$ and lemma 2.16,

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) = \tau_j \operatorname{cl}\big(V(x) \cap Y\big) = \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x).$$

Therefore, since $Z \subset Y$, we have

$$\begin{gathered}(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Z = \big(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \setminus V(x)\big) \cap Z = \\ = \big(\big(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \setminus V(x)\big) \cap Y\big) \cap Z = \big((\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \setminus V(x)) \cap Y\big) \cap Z = \\ = \big(\tau'_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \setminus V'(x)\big) \cap Z = (j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z.\end{gathered}$$

Moreover, since X is (i,j)-regular, one can assume that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$. Hence, for each $x \in Z$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and

$$\begin{gathered}(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Z, X\big) = \\ = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z, X\big) \leq \\ \leq (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z, Y\big) \leq k-1.\end{gathered}$$

Therefore, (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,X) \leq k$ and thus, (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,X) \leq (i,j)$-$\operatorname{ind}(Z,Y)$. ☐

Proposition 7.10. *If* (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X)$ *is finite, then* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *is* (i,j)*-superregular in* X *and so,* Y *is* (i,j)-WS*-superregular in* X*,* Y *is* (i,j)*-strongly regular in* X*,* Y *is* (i,j)*-regular in* X*,* Y *is* (i,j)-WS*-quasi regular in* X*,* Y *is* (i,j)-WS*-regular in* X *and* Y *is* (i,j)*-regular.*

Proof. Let $x \in Y$, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \overline{\in} F$. Then $x \in X \setminus F = U(x) \in \tau_i$ and since $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) < \infty$, there is $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$. Hence

$$F = X \setminus U(x) \subset X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) = \tau_j \operatorname{int}\big(X \setminus V(x)\big) = U(F) \in \tau_j$$

and $U(x) \cap U(F) = \varnothing$. Thus Y is (i,j)-superregular in X.

The rest follows from implications after Definition 2.2. $\square$

Corollary 7.11. *If* $\operatorname{ind}(Y,X)$ *is finite, then* (Y,τ') *is superregular in* X *and so,* Y *is* WS-*superregular in* X, Y *is strongly regular in* X, Y *is regular in* X, Y *is* WS-*quasi regular in* X, Y *is* WS-*regular in* X *and* Y *is regular.*

Proposition 7.12. *If* (X,τ_1,τ_2) *is p-normal,* $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ *and* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} Y = 0$, *then* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) = 0$.

Proof. We shall prove that for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and $(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \setminus V(x)) \cap Y = \varnothing$. Since $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} Y = 0$, for $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is $V \in \tau'_i \cap \operatorname{co}\tau'_j$ in (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) such that $x \in V \subset U(x) \cap Y$. Since $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and (X,τ_1,τ_2) is p-normal, for $V \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ and $Y \setminus V \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ there are $U(V) \in \tau_i$, $U(Y \setminus V) \in \tau_j$ such that $U(V) \cap U(Y \setminus V) = \varnothing$. Moreover, since $V \subset U(x)$, by (4) of Definition 1.1, there is $E(V) \in \tau_i$ such that $V \subset E(V) \subset \tau_j \operatorname{cl} E(V) \subset U(x)$. Let $W(V) = E(V) \cap U(V)$. Then

$$V \subset W(V) \subset \tau_j \operatorname{cl} W(V) \subset X \setminus (Y \setminus V) = (X \setminus Y) \cup V.$$

It is evident that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} W(V) \subset U(x)$ and $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} W(V) \cap Y = \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V = V$. Hence

$$(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X W(V) \cap Y = \big(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} W(V) \setminus W(V)\big) \cap Y = V \setminus V = \varnothing. \quad \square$$

Proposition 7.13. *If* (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) *is* (i,j)-WS-*superregular in* X *and* Y *is* (i,j)-*extremally disconnected in* X, *then* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) = 0$.

Proof. Indeed, by Proposition 3.7, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}_x X = 0$ for each point $x \in Y$, i.e., for any $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is $V(x) \in \tau_i \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ such that $V(x) \subset U(x)$. Clearly, $(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) = \varnothing$ implies that $(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y = \varnothing$ and thus $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) = 0$. $\square$

Corollary 7.14. *If* (Y,τ') *is* WS-*superregular in* X *and* Y *is extremally disconnected in* X, *then* $\operatorname{ind}(Y,X) = 0$.

Definition 7.15. For a BsS (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) a pair (x,A), where $x \in Y$, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \overline{\in} A$, is said to be a relatively

i-regular pair. A relative partition, corresponding to the pair (x, A), is a p-closed set $T \subset X$ such that $X \setminus T$ is not p-connected and

$$(X \setminus T) \cap Y = Y \setminus T \subset H_1 \cup H_2, \quad x \in H'_i = H_i \cap Y \in \tau'_i,$$
$$A \subset H_j \in \tau_j \text{ and } H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing.$$

Remark 7.16. Let (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) and (x, A) be a relatively i-regular pair. Then

1. If there is a neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ ($U(A) \in \tau_j$) such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(x) \subset X \setminus A$ ($\tau_i \operatorname{cl} U(A) \subset X \setminus \{x\}$), then (j,i)-$\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)$ ((i,j)-$\operatorname{Fr}_X U(A)$) is a relative partition, corresponding to (x, A).
2. If T is a relative partition, corresponding to (x, A), then (j,i)-$\operatorname{Fr}_X H_i \cap Y \subset T \cap Y$ ((i,j)-$\operatorname{Fr}_X H_j \cap Y \subset T \cap Y$).

Indeed, suppose, for example, in (1) that $U(x) \in \tau_i$ and $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(x) \subset X \setminus A$. Then

$$X \setminus (j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X U(x) = \big(X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(x)\big) \cup U(x) = H_j \cup H_i,$$
$$H_i \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}, \quad H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing,$$
$$x \in H'_i \subset H_i = U(x), \quad A \subset H_j = X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(x).$$

Hence, taking into account Definition 7.15, (j,i)-$\operatorname{Fr}_X U(x)$ is a relative partition, corresponding to (x, A) since

$$\big(X \setminus (j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X U(x)\big) \cap Y = Y \setminus (j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X U(x) \subset H_1 \cup H_2.$$

(2) Since T is a relative partition, corresponding to (x, A), we have

$$(X \setminus T) \cap Y = Y \setminus T \subset H_1 \cup H_2,$$

where $H_i \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$, $x \in H'_i = H_i \cap Y$ and $A \subset H_j$. Hence

$$(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X H_i \cap (Y \setminus T) =$$
$$= \big(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} H_i \cap (X \setminus H_i)\big) \cap (Y \setminus T) \subset (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} H_i \setminus H_i) \cap (H_i \cup H_j) = \varnothing$$

since $H_j \in \tau_j$. Thus (j,i)-$\operatorname{Fr}_X H_i \cap Y \subset T \cap Y$.

Theorem 7.17. *Let* (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). *Then* (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y, X) \leq n$ *if and only if to every relatively i-regular pair* (x, A), $x \in Y$, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ *and* $x \overline{\in} A$, *there corresponds a relative partition* T *such that* (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(T \cap Y, X) \leq n-1$.

Proof. Let (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y, X) \leq n$ and (x, A) be any relatively i-regular pair. Then $x \in U(x) = X \setminus A \in \tau_i$. Since (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y, X) \leq n$, by (2) of Definition 7.1, there is $V(x) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \leq n-1.$$

By (1) of Remark 7.16, (j,i)-$\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x)$ is a relative partition, corresponding to (x,A) and so, the first part is proved.

Conversely, let us suppose that the condition is satisfied and prove that (i,j)-$\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \leq n$. If $x \in Y$ is any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ is any neighborhood, then the pair $(x, A = X \setminus U(x))$ is a relatively i-regular pair. Hence, by condition, there is a relative partition T for (x,A) such that (i,j)-$\mathrm{ind}(T \cap Y, X) \leq n-1$. But $Y \setminus T \subset H_1 \cup H_2$, where $x \in H'_i \subset H_i$, $A \subset H_j$ and $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} H_i \cap H_j = \varnothing$, so that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} H_i \subset X \setminus H_j \subset X \setminus A = U(x)$. Let $H_i = V(x)$. Then $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and by (2) of Remark 7.16,

$$(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, H_i \cap Y = (j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y \subset T \cap Y.$$

Since (i,j)-$\mathrm{ind}(T \cap Y, X) \leq n-1$ and (j,i)-$\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y \subset T \cap Y$, by (3) of Theorem 7.3,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \leq n-1$$

and thus (i,j)-$\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \leq n$. □

Definition 7.18. Let (Y,τ') be a TsS of a TS (X,τ). Then a pair (x,A), where $x \in Y$, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau$ and $x \overline{\in} A$, is said to be a relatively regular pair. A relative partition, corresponding to the pair (x,A), is a closed set $T \subset X$ such that $(X \setminus T) \cap Y = Y \setminus T \subset H_1 \cup H_2$, $x \in H'_i = H_i \cap Y \in \tau'$, $A \subset H_j \in \tau$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$.

Now, if (Y,τ') is a TsS of a TS (X,τ) and (x,A) is a relatively regular pair, then the topological version of Remark 7.14 gives:

1. If there is a neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau$ ($U(A) \in \tau$) such that $\tau \operatorname{cl} U(x) \subset X \setminus A$ ($\tau \operatorname{cl} U(A) \subset X \setminus \{x\}$), then $\mathrm{Fr}_X\, U(x)$ ($\mathrm{Fr}_X\, U(A)$) is a relative partition, corresponding to (x,A).
2. If T is a relative partition, corresponding to (x,A), then $\mathrm{Fr}_X\, H_i \cap Y \subset T \cap Y$.

By analogy with Theorem 7.17, we obtain the following new characterization of the small relative inductive dimension.

Theorem 7.19. *Let* (Y,τ') *be a* TsS *of a* TS (X,τ). *Then* $\mathrm{ind}(Y,X) \leq n$ *in the sense of Filippov if and only if to every relatively regular pair* (x,A), $x \in Y$, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau$ *and* $x \overline{\in} A$, *there corresponds a relative partition* T *such that* $\mathrm{ind}(T \cap Y, X) \leq n-1$.

8. (i,j)-Large Relative Inductive Dimension Functions

Definition 8.1. Let (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) be a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) and n denote a nonnegative integer. We say that:

1. (i,j)-$\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)=-1$ if and only if $Y=\varnothing$.
2. (i,j)-$\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ if for any set $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau'_j$ and any neighborhood $U(F)\in\tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(F)\in\tau_i$ such that $\tau_j\operatorname{cl}V(F)\subset U(F)$ and (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}\big((j,i)$-$\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\cap Y,X\big)\le n-1$.
3. (i,j)-$\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)=n$ if (i,j)-$\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ and (i,j)-$\operatorname{ind}(Y,X)\le n-1$ does not hold.
4. (i,j)-$\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)=\infty$ if the inequality (i,j)-$\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ does not hold for any n.

As a rule

$$p\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n\Longleftrightarrow\big((1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n\wedge(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n\big).$$

It follows immediately from (2) of Definition 8.1 and (3) of Proposition 2.9 that if (i,j)-$\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$ is finite, then Y is (j,i)-supernormal in X and hence, Y is p-strongly normal in X, Y is (j,i)-WS-supernormal in X, Y is p-normal in X, Y is (j,i)-WS-normal in X, Y is p-quasi normal in X, Y is p-internally normal in X, Y is p-normal and Y is p-normal in X from inside.

Remark 8.2. By analogy with Remark 7.2 one can prove that $(i,j)\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ if and only if for any set $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau'_j$ and any neighborhood $U(F)\in\tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(F)\in\tau_i$ such that $\tau_j\operatorname{cl}V(F)\subset U(F)$ and (i,j)-$\operatorname{Ind}\big((j,i)$-$\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\cap Y\big)\le n-1$.

Definition 8.3. Let (Y,τ') be a TsS of a TS (X,τ) and n denote a nonnegative integer. We say that:

1. $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)=-1$ if and only if $Y=\varnothing$.
2. $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ if for any set $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau'$ and any neighborhood $U(F)\in\tau$ there is a neighborhood $V(F)\in\tau$ such that $\tau\operatorname{cl}V(F)\subset U(F)$ and $\operatorname{Ind}(\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\cap Y,X)\le n-1(\Longleftrightarrow$ for any set $F\in\operatorname{co}\tau'$ and any neighborhood $U(F)\in\tau$ there is a neighborhood $V(F)\in\tau$ such that $\tau\operatorname{cl}V(F)\subset U(F)$ and $\operatorname{Ind}(\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\cap Y)\le n-1)$.
3. $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)=n$ if $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ and $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n-1$ does not hold.
4. $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)=\infty$ if $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ does not hold for any n.

Hence, if $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$ is finite, then (Y,τ') is supernormal in X, Y is strongly normal in X, Y is WS-supernormal is X, Y is normal in X, Y is WS-normal in X, Y is quasi normal in X, Y is internally normal in X, Y is normal and Y is normal in X from inside.

Proposition 8.4. *If* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *is a* j-T_1 BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), *then* (i,j)-$\mathrm{ind}(Y, X) \leq (i,j)$-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y, X)$.

Hence, if (Y, τ') *is a* T_1 TsS *of a* TS (X, τ), *then* $\mathrm{ind}(Y, X) \leq \mathrm{Ind}(Y, X)$.

Theorem 8.5. *For a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}\, Y \leq (i,j)$-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y, X)$.
(2) *If* $Y \in \mathrm{co}\,\tau_j$, *then* (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y, X) \leq (i,j)$-$\mathrm{Ind}\, X$.
(3) (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(X, X) = (i,j)$-$\mathrm{Ind}\, X$.

Proof. (1) We shall use the induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)$-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y, X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \mathrm{co}\,\tau_j'$ and $U'(F) \in \tau_i'$. If $U(F) \in \tau_i$, $U(F) \cap Y = U'(F)$, then (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y, X) = k$ implies that there is $V(F) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j\,\mathrm{cl}\, V(F) \subset U(F)$ and (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1$. Hence, by inductive assumption,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y\big) \leq k-1.$$

Let $V'(F) = V(F) \cap Y$. Then

$$\begin{gathered}(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(F) = \tau_j'\,\mathrm{cl}\, V'(F) \setminus V'(F) = \\ = \big(\tau_j\,\mathrm{cl}\, V'(F) \cap Y\big) \setminus \big(V(F) \cap Y\big) \subseteq \big(\tau_j\,\mathrm{cl}\, V(F) \setminus V(F)\big) \cap Y = \\ = (j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y\end{gathered}$$

and since (j,i)-$\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(F)$ is p-closed in Y, it is also p-closed in (j,i)-$\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y$. Therefore, by (2) of Proposition 3.2.7 in [8],

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(F)\big) \leq (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y\big) \leq k-1.$$

Hence, by Corollary 3.2.9 in [8], (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}\, Y \leq k$ and so (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}\, Y \leq (i,j)$-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y, X)$.

(2) The induction will be used under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)$-$\mathrm{Ind}\, X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \mathrm{co}\,\tau_j' \subset \mathrm{co}\,\tau_j$ and $U(F) \in \tau_i$. Since (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}\, X = k$, by Corollary 3.2.9 in [8] there is $V(F) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j\,\mathrm{cl}\, V(F) \subset U(F)$ and (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(j,i)$-$\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F) \leq k-1$. Clearly, $Y \in \mathrm{co}\,\tau_j \subset p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$ implies that the set (j,i)-$\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y$ is p-closed in X and so, by the second part of Remark 2.12, it is p-closed in (j,i)-$\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F)$ too. Hence, by inductive assumption,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y, (j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F)\big) \leq k-1.$$

and by (1), (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y\big) \leq k-1$. Therefore, by Remark 8.2, (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y, X) \leq k$ and thus (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y, X) \leq (i,j)$-$\mathrm{Ind}\, X$.

(3) If $Y = X$, then (1) and (2) imply that

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}\, X \le (i,j)\text{-Ind}(X,X) \le (i,j)\text{-Ind}\, X$$

and so $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(X,X) = (i,j)\text{-Ind}\, X$. □

Corollary 8.6. *Let* (Y,τ') *be a* TsS *of a* TS (X,τ)*. Then*

(1) $\operatorname{Ind} Y \le \operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$.

(2) *If* $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau$*, then* $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) \le \operatorname{Ind} X$.

(3) $\operatorname{Ind}(X,X) = \operatorname{Ind} X$.

Proposition 8.7. *For a* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of a hereditarily* p*-normal* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *we have* $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X) = (i,j)\text{-Ind}\, Y$.

Proof. By (1) of Theorem 8.5, it suffices to prove only that

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X) \le (i,j)\text{-Ind}\, Y.$$

First of all, recall that by the proof of the first part of Proposition 7.6, for any set $U' \in \tau_i'$ there is a set $U \in \tau_i$ such that $U \cap Y = U'$ and $(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, U \cap Y = (j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, U'$.

Now, we shall use the induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)\text{-Ind}\, Y$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j'$ and $U(F) \in \tau_i$ be an arbitrary neighborhood. Since $(i,j)\text{-Ind}\, Y = k$, there is $V'(F) \in \tau_i'$ such that $\tau_j' \operatorname{cl} V'(F) \subset U(F) \cap Y$ and $(i,j)\text{-Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(F)\big) \le k-1$. For the set $V'(F)$ there is a set $V(F) \in \tau_i$ such that $V(F) \cap Y = V'(F)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y\big) \le k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive assumption,

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \le$$
$$\le (i,j)\text{-Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(F) \cap Y\big) \le k-1.$$

Therefore, $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X) \le k$ and so, $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X) \le (i,j)\text{-Ind}\, Y$. □

Corollary 8.8. *If* (Y,τ') *is a* TsS *of a hereditarily normal* TS (X,τ)*, then* $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) = \operatorname{Ind} Y$.

Take place the following important **monotonicity property of the (i,j)-large relative inductive dimension functions**.

Theorem 8.9. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'') \subset (Y,\tau_1',\tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$*, the* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *is hereditarily* p*-normal and* $Z \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y)$*, then*

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,X) \le (i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X).$$

Proof. Since (X,τ_1,τ_2) is hereditarily p-normal, by Proposition 8.7, $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X) = (i,j)\text{-Ind}\, Y$ and $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,X) = (i,j)\text{-Ind}\, Z$. On the other hand, since $Z \in p\text{-}\mathcal{Cl}(Y)$, by (2) of Proposition 3.2.7 in [8],

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,X) = (i,j)\text{-Ind}\, Z \le (i,j)\text{-Ind}\, Y = (i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X). \qquad \square$$

Corollary 8.10. *If* $(Z,\tau'') \subset (Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$, *the* TS (X,τ) *is hereditarily normal and* $Z \in \operatorname{co}\tau'$, *then* $\operatorname{Ind}(Z,X) \le \operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$.

Proposition 8.11. *If* (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *is* (j,i)-WS-*supernormal in* (X,τ_1,τ_2) *and* Y *is* (i,j)-*extremally disconnected in* X, *then* $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X) = 0$.

Proof. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j'$ and $U(F) \in \tau_i$. Then by (2) of Proposition 2.9, there is $V'(F) \in \tau_i'$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(F) \subset U(F)$. Since Y is (i,j)-extremally disconnected in X, $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(F) = V(F) \in \tau_i \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ and so $(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X V(F) = \varnothing$. Hence $(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y = \varnothing$ and thus $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X) = 0$. $\square$

Corollary 8.12. *If* (Y,τ') *is* WS-*supernormal in* (X,τ) *and* Y *is extremally disconnected in* X, *then* $\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) = 0$.

Definition 8.13. A BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) is said to be hereditarily (i,j)-WS-supernormal in X if every set $Z \in p\text{-}\mathcal{Cl}(Y)$ is (i,j)-WS-supernormal in X.

It is evident that every hereditarily p-WS-supernormal BsS Y of X is p-WS-supernormal in X and, moreover, by the second part of Remark 2.12, every p-closed subset of a hereditarily p-WS-supernormal BsS Y of X is also hereditarily p-WS-supernormal in X.

Theorem 8.14. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'') \subset (Y,\tau_1',\tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$, *where* Y *is hereditarily* (j,i)-WS-*supernormal in* X *and* $Z \in p\text{-}\mathcal{Cl}(Y)$, *then*

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,Y) \le (i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,X) \le (i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X).$$

Proof. First, let us prove the right inequality, i.e., the monotonicity property of the (i,j)-large relative inductive dimensions, by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X)$. Let this inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. If $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j''$ and $U(F) \in \tau_i$ are any sets, then $F \cap \Phi = \varnothing$, where $\Phi = X \setminus U(F) \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$. Since $Z \in p\text{-}\mathcal{Cl}(Y)$, by condition Z is (j,i)-WS-supernormal in X and so, there are $V(F) \in \tau_i''$, $V(\Phi) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(F) \cap V(\Phi) = \varnothing$. Hence $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} F \cap Y = \tau_j' \operatorname{cl} F \subset U(F)$ as

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} F \subset \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset X \setminus V(\Phi) \subset X \setminus \Phi = U(F).$$

Since $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X) = k$, there is $W(\tau_j' \operatorname{cl} F) = W(F) \in \tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} W(F) \subset U(F)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X W(F) \cap Y, X\big) \le k-1.$$

Clearly, we have

$$(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, W(F)\cap Z \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, W(F)\cap Y\big),$$

where by remark before Theorem 8.14, $(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, W(F)\cap Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y)$ implies that $(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, W(F)\cap Y$ is also hereditarily (j,i)-WS-supernormal in X. Therefore, by inductive hypothesis,

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}\,\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, W(F)\cap Z, X\big) \leq$$
$$\leq (i,j)\text{-Ind}\,\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, W(F)\cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1$$

and hence, $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,X)\leq k$. Thus $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,X)\leq (i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X)$.

Now, we also use the induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,X)$. Let the left inequality be proved for $n\leq k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. Let $F\in \operatorname{co}\tau_i''$ and $U'(F)\in\tau_i'$ be any sets. Since $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,X)=k$, for F and $U(F)\in\tau_i$, where $U(F)\cap Y = U'(F)$, there is $V(F)\in\tau_i$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(F)\subset U(F)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}\,\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(F)\cap Z, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Let $V'(F)=V(F)\cap Y$. Then $\tau_j' \operatorname{cl} V'(F)\subset U'(F)$ and since

$$(j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(F) \subseteq (j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(F)\cap Y, \quad Z\subset Y,$$

we have

$$(j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(F)\cap Z \subseteq (j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(F)\cap Z.$$

Since by the second part of Remark 2.12,

$$(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(F)\cap Z \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Z)\subset p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y),$$

the BsS $(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(F)\cap Z$ is hereditarily p-WS-supernormal in X. Moreover,

$$(j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(F)\cap Z \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(F)\cap Z\big)$$

and by the right inequality,

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}\,\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(F)\cap Z, X\big) \leq$$
$$\leq (i,j)\text{-Ind}\,\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\, V(F)\cap Z, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive assumption,

$$(i,j)\text{-Ind}\,\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(F)\cap Z, Y\big) \leq$$
$$\leq (i,j)\text{-Ind}\,\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(F)\cap Z, X\big) \leq k-1$$

and so, $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,Y)\leq k$. Thus, $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,Y)\leq (i,j)\text{-Ind}(Z,X)$. $\square$

It is clear, that for the topological case every WS-supernormal TsS (Y,τ') of a TS (X,τ) is hereditarily WS-supernormal in X so that a TsS (Y,τ') is WS-supernormal in X if and only if (Y,τ') is hereditarily WS-supernormal in X. Hence, take place

Corollary 8.15. *If* $(Z,\tau'') \subset (Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$, *where* Y *is* WS-*supernormal in* X *and* $Z \in \operatorname{co}\tau'$, *then* $\operatorname{Ind}(Z,Y) \leq \operatorname{Ind}(Z,X) \leq \operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$.

Theorem 8.16. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'' < \tau_2'') \subset (Y,\tau_1' < \tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *and* $Z \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$, *then*

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Z,Y) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Z,X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X).$$

Proof. First, let us prove the right inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2''$ and $U(F) \in \tau_1$. Then $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and since $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) = k$, there is $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$ and

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Clearly,

$$(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Z \subseteq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y,$$

and $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\cap Z \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'''$ in the BsS $((2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\cap Y, \tau_1''' < \tau_2''')$. Hence, by inductive assumption,

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Z, X\big) \leq$$
$$\leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Thus, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Z,X) \leq k$ and so $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Z,X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$.

Now, let us prove the left inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Z,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2''$ and $U'(F) \in \tau_1'$ be any sets. Since $F \subseteq Z \subseteq Y$ and $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Z,X) = k$, for $U(F) \in \tau_1$, where $U(F) \cap Y = U'(F)$, there is $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$ and

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Z, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Let $V'(F) = V(F) \cap Y$. Then $\tau_2' \operatorname{cl} V'(F) \subset U'(F)$. Since

$$(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F) \subseteq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y$$

and $Z \subset Y$, we have

$$(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F) \cap Z \subseteq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Z.$$

Since $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F) \cap Z$ is 2-closed in $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Z$, by the right inequality we have:

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F) \cap Z, X\big) \leq$$
$$\leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Z, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Therefore, by inductive hypothesis,

$$(1,2)\text{-Ind}\big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(F)\cap Z, Y\big)\le$$
$$\le (1,2)\text{-Ind}\big((2,1)\text{-Fr}_Y\, V'(F)\cap Z, X\big)\le k-1.$$

Thus $(1,2)\text{-Ind}(Z,Y)\le k$ and so $(1,2)\text{-Ind}(Z,Y)\le(1,2)\text{-Ind}(Z,X)$. □

Definition 8.17. Let (Y,τ_1',τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2). Then a pair (A,B), where $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_j'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$, is said to be a relatively p-normal pair. A relative partition, corresponding to the pair (A,B), is a p-closed set $T\subset X$ such that $X\setminus T$ is not p-connected, $(X\setminus T)\cap Y=Y\setminus T\subset H_1\cup H_2$, $A\subset H_i'=H_i\cap Y\in\tau_i'$, $B\subset H_j\in\tau_j$ and $H_1\cap H_2=\varnothing$.

Remark 8.18. Let (Y,τ_1',τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) and (A,B) be a relatively p-normal pair. Then

1. If there is a neighborhood $U(A)\in\tau_i$ ($U(B)\in\tau_j$) such that $\tau_j\operatorname{cl}U(A)\subset X\setminus B$ ($\tau_i\operatorname{cl}U(B)\subset X\setminus A$), then $(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\,U(A)$ ($(i,j)\text{-Fr}_X\,U(B)$) is a relative partition, corresponding to (A,B).
2. If T is a relative partition, corresponding to (A,B), then $(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\,H_i\cap Y\subset T\cap Y$ ($(i,j)\text{-Fr}_X\,H_j\cap Y\subset T\cap Y$).

The proof is similar to the proof of Remark 7.16.

Theorem 8.19. *If (Y,τ_1',τ_2') is a* BsS *of a hereditarily p-normal* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2)*, then $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ if and only if to any relatively p-normal pair (A,B), $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_j'$, $B\in\operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $A\cap B=\varnothing$, there corresponds a relative partition T such that $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(T\cap Y,X)\le n-1$.*

Proof. Let, first, $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ and (A,B) be any relatively p-normal pair. Then $A\subset U(A)=X\setminus B\in\tau_i$ and since $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(Y,X)\le n$, by (2) of Definition 8.1, there is $V(A)\in\tau_i$ such that

$$\tau_j\operatorname{cl}V(A)\subset U(A)\ \text{ and }\ (i,j)\text{-Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\,V(A)\cap Y,X\big)\le n-1.$$

But, by (1) of Remark 8.18, $(j,i)\text{-Fr}_X\,V(A)$ is a relative partition, corresponding to (A,B), and thus, the first part is proved.

Conversely, let us suppose that the condition is satisfied, $A\in\operatorname{co}\tau_j'$ be any set and $U(A)\in\tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Then $(A,B=X\setminus U(A))$ is a relatively p-normal pair and by condition, there is a relative partition T, corresponding to (A,B), such that $(i,j)\text{-Ind}(T\cap Y,X)\le n-1$. Since by Definition 8.17, $Y\setminus T\subset H_1\cup H_2$, where $A\subset H_i\in\tau_i$, $B\subset H_j\in\tau_j$ and $H_1\cap H_2=\varnothing$, we have $\tau_j\operatorname{cl}H_i\cap H_j=\varnothing$ and so

$$\tau_j\operatorname{cl}H_i\subset X\setminus H_j\subset X\setminus B=U(A).$$

If $H_i = V(A) \in \tau_i$, then $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(A) \subset U(A)$. Moreover, by (2) of Remark 8.18, $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A) \cap Y \subset T \cap Y$ and since $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A) \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(X)$, we have $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A) \cap Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(Y)$. By the second part of Remark 2.12, $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A) \cap Y \subset T \cap Y$ implies

$$(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A) \cap Y \in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(T \cap Y)$$

and by Theorem 8.9,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A) \cap Y, X\big) \le (i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(T \cap Y, X) \le n-1$$

so that $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X) \le n$. □

Definition 8.20. Let (Y,τ') be a TsS of a TS (X,τ). Then a pair (A,B), where $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$, is said to be a relatively normal pair. A relative partition, corresponding to (A,B), is a set $T \in \operatorname{co}\tau$ such that $X \setminus T$ is not connected, $(X \setminus T) \cap Y = Y \setminus T \subset H_1 \cup H_2$, $A \subset H_1' = H_1 \cap Y \in \tau'$, $B \subset H_2 \in \tau$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$.

Remark 8.21. Let (Y,τ') be a TsS of a TS (X,τ) and (A,B) be a relatively normal pair. Then

1. If there is a neighborhood $U(A) \in \tau$ ($U(B) \in \tau$) such that $\tau \operatorname{cl} U(A) \subset X \setminus B$ ($\tau \operatorname{cl} U(B) \subset X \setminus A$), then $\mathrm{Fr}_X U(A)$ ($\mathrm{Fr}_X U(B)$) is a relative partition, corresponding to (A,B).
2. If T is a partition, corresponding to (A,B), then $\mathrm{Fr}\, H_i \cap Y \subset T \cap Y$.

Proposition 8.22. *If* (Y,τ') *is a* TsS *of a* TS (X,τ), *where* X *is hereditarily normal, then* $\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X) \le n$ *if and only if to every relatively normal pair* (A,B) *there corresponds a relative partition* T *such that* $\mathrm{Ind}(T \cap Y, X) \le n-1$.

Proposition 8.23. *If* $(Y,\tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *is a* BsS *of a* BS $(X,\tau_1 < \tau_2)$, *then* $(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X) \le n$ *if and only if to every relatively p-normal pair* (A,B), $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ *and* $A \cap B = \varnothing$, *there corresponds a relative partition* T *such that* $(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(T \cap Y, X) \le n-1$.

Proof. The proof of the first part is given by the proof of the first part of Theorem 8.19 for $i=1$, $j=2$.

Conversely, if the condition is satisfied, then by analogy with the proof of the second part of Theorem 8.19, for $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $U(A) \in \tau_1$ there is $V(A) \in \tau_1$ such that $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(A) \subset U(A)$ and $(2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A) \cap Y \subset T \cap Y$. Since $(2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A) \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$, we have $(2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A) \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2''$ in $(T \cap Y, \tau_1'', \tau_2'')$. Hence, by Proposition 8.16,

$$(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A) \cap Y, X\big) \le (1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(T \cap Y, X) \le n-1$$

and thus $(1,2)$-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$. □

Theorem 8.24. *If* (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *is a hereditarily* (j,i)-WS-*supernormal* BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2), *then* (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ *if and only if to any relatively p-normal pair* (A,B), $A\in\mathrm{co}\,\tau_j'$, $B\in\mathrm{co}\,\tau_i$ *and* $A\cap B=\varnothing$, *there corresponds a relative partition* $T\subset X$ *such that* (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(T\cap Y,X)\le n-1$.

Proof. The proof of the first part is similar to the proof of the first part of Theorem 8.19.

For the proof of the second part, let us recall that by the proof of the second part of Theorem 8.19, for $A\in\mathrm{co}\,\tau_j'$ and $U(A)\in\tau_i$ there is $V(A)\in\tau_i$ such that $\tau_j\,\mathrm{cl}\,V(A)\subset U(A)$ and (j,i)-$\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(A)\cap Y\subset T\cap Y$.

Clearly, (j,i)-$\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(A)\cap Y\in p$-$\mathcal{C}l(Y)$ and by the second part of Remark 2.12,

$$(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(A)\cap Y\in p\text{-}\mathcal{C}l(T\cap Y).$$

Hence, by Definition 8.13, (j,i)-$\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(A)\cap Y$ is (j,i)-WS-supernormal in X and Theorem 8.14 gives

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(A)\cap Y,X\big)\le(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(T\cap Y,X)\le n-1.$$

Thus (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$. □

Corollary 8.25. *If* (Y,τ') *is a* WS-*supernormal* TsS *of a* TS (X,τ), *then* $\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)\le n$ *if and only if to any relatively normal pair* (A,B) *there corresponds a relative partition* $T\subset X$ *such that* $\mathrm{Ind}(T\cap Y,X)\le n-1$.

Proof. It suffices to recall that by the remark before Corollary 8.15, every WS-supernormal TsS (Y,τ') of a TS (X,τ) is hereditarily WS-supernormal in X. □

At the end of the section let us recall once more that Theorem 8.19 says that for an arbitrary BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') of a hereditarily p-normal BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) its relative inductive dimension functions (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)$ can be characterized in two equivalent ways: as by neighborhoods so by partitions. The similar result is given by Theorem 8.24 but for hereditarily (j,i)-WS-supernormal BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') in a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2). In both cases the characterizations are conditioned by the monotonicity property of the relative inductive dimension functions (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)$. i.e., by the inequality (i,j)-$\mathrm{Ind}(Z,X)\le(i,j)$-$\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)$ for $Z\in p$-$\mathcal{C}l(Y)$ (Theorems 8.9 and 8.14).

Moreover, for the topological case the requirement of hereditary WS-supernormality of a TsS (Y,τ') in a TS (X,τ) can be weakened to the requirement of WS-supernormality of Y in X (Corollaries 8.15 and 8.25).

9. (i,j)-Small Separate Inductive Dimension Functions and (i,j)-Small Separate Relative Inductive Dimension Functions

Definition 9.1. Let (X,τ_1,τ_2) be a BS and n denote a nonnegative integer. Then

(1) $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X=-1$ if and only if $X=\varnothing$.

(2) $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X\leq n$ if for each point $x\in X$ and any neighborhood $U(x)\in\tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x)\in\tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x)\subset U(x)$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x))\leq n-1$.

(3) $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X=n$ if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X\leq n$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X\leq n-1$ does not hold.

(4) $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X=\infty$ if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X\leq n$ does not hold for any n.

As usual

$$p\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X\leq n \Longleftrightarrow \big((1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X\leq n\wedge(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X\leq n\big).$$

It follows immediately from Proposition 2.33 that if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$ is finite, then (X,τ_1,τ_2) is (i,j)-separately regular.

Proposition 9.2. *If* (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) *is an arbitrary* BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2), *then* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y\leq(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$.

Proof. We shall use the induction under a nonnegative integer $n=(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n\leq k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. If $x\in Y$ and $U'(x)\in\tau'_i$, then there is $U(x)\in\tau_i$ such that $U(x)\cap Y=U'(x)$. Since $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X=k$, there is $V(x)\in\tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x)\subset U(x)$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x))\leq k-1$. Now, for $V'(x)=V(x)\cap Y$,

$$\tau'_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x)=\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x)\cap Y\subset U(x)\cap Y=U'(x)$$

and $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(x)\subset j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)$. Then, by inductive assumption,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(x))\leq(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x))\leq k-1,$$

and hence, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y\leq k$ so that $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y\leq(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$. □

Theorem 9.3. *The following inequalities hold for a* BS $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$:

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X\leq i\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X\leq(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X,$$

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X\leq(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \quad \textit{and} \quad (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X\leq(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X.$$

Proof. For $i=1$ first let us prove the right upper inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n=(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. If $x \in X$ is any point and $U(x) \in \tau_1$ is any neighborhood, then $U(x) \in \tau_2$ and since $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X = k$, there is $V(x) \in \tau_1$ such that

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \ \text{ and } \ (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\big) \leq k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive hypothesis, $1\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$ and so $1\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, X \leq k$. Thus $1\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, X \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$.

Let the left upper inequality be proved for a nonnegative integer $n \leq k-1$, where $n = 1\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, X$, and prove it for $n=k$. If $x \in X$ is any point and $U(x) \in \tau_1$ is any neighborhood, then by $k = 1\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, X$ there is $V(x) \in \tau_1$ such that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and $1\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$. Now, by monotonicity of the small inductive dimension $1\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$ as $2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \subset 1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)$. Hence, by inductive assumption $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$. Clearly, $V(x) \in \tau_2$ and $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ so that $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \leq k$. Thus $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \leq 1\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$.

For $i=2$ first let us prove the left upper inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = 2\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. Let $x \in X$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_1$ be any neighborhood. Since $U(x) \in \tau_1 \subset \tau_2$ and $2\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, X = k$, there is $V(x) \in \tau_2$ such that $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and $2\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$. Then, by inductive assumption, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$ and so $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \leq k$. Hence $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \leq 2\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, X$.

Now, let $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X = n$ and the right upper inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$. Let us prove this inequality for $n=k$. If $x \in X$ is any point and $U(x) \in \tau_2$ is any neighborhood, then $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X = k$ implies that there is $V(x) \in \tau_1 \subset \tau_2$ such that

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \ \text{ and } \ (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\big) \leq k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive hypothesis, $2\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$. On the other hand, $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and so $2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \subset 1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)$. Now, by monotonicity, $2\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$. Thus $2\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, X \leq k$ and so $2\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, X \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$.

Now, let us consider the lower inequalities. Let $(2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{sind}\, X = n$ and let us prove that $(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}\, X \leq (2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{sind}\, X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. If $x \in X$ is any point and $U(x) \in \tau_1$ is any neighborhood, then $U(x) \in \tau_2$ and by $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X = k$ there is $V(x) \in \tau_1$ such that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$. Hence, by inductive assumption, $(1,2)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$. Evidently, $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$, $(2,1)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \subset 1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)$ and by monotonicity of the small bitopological dimension, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)\big) \leq k-1$. Thus, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X \leq k$ and so $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$.

Finally, let us prove the inequality $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X$ by induction under $n = (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. If $x \in X$ is any point and $U(x) \in \tau_1$ is any neighborhood, then $U(x) \in \tau_2$ and by $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X = k$ there is $V(x) \in \tau_2$ such that

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \ \text{ and } \ (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{ind}\big((1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)\big) \leq k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive assumption, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}((1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$. Clearly, $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$, $2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x) \subset (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)$ and by Proposition 9.2, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)) \leq k-1$. Hence, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \leq k$ and so $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X$. ☐

Corollary 9.4. *For a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *we have:*

1. *If* $\tau_1 <_C \tau_2$, *then* $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$.
2. *If* $\tau_1 <_N \tau_2$, *then* $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \leq (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{ind} X \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X$.

Proof. Follows directly from Theorem 9.3 taking into account (5) and (6) of Theorem 3.1.36 in [8]. ☐

Proposition 9.5. *If a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is (i,j)-separately regular and j-extremally disconnected, then* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X = 0$.

Proof. Let $x \in X$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Then, by proposition 2.33, there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$. Since X is j-extremally disconnected, the set $W(x) = \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \in \tau_j \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ and hence, $j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X W(x) = \varnothing$. Thus, by (2) of Definition 9.1, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X = 0$. ☐

Definition 9.6. Let (x, A) be an i-regular pair in a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), that is, $x \in X$, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $x \overline{\in} A$. Then we say that a j-closed set $T \subset X$ is a separate partition, corresponding to the pair (x, A), if $X \setminus T$ is not j-connected so that $X \setminus T = H_1 \cup H_2$, where $H_1,\ H_2 \in \tau_j \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $x \in H_1$, $A \subset H_2$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$.

Remark 9.7. One can easily to verify that in a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) the following conditions are satisfied for an i-regular pair (x, A):

1. If there exists a j-open neighborhood $U(x)$ (j-open neighborhood $U(A)$) such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(x) \subset X \setminus A$ ($\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(A) \subset X \setminus \{x\}$), then the set $j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X U(x)$ ($j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X U(A)$) is a separate partition, corresponding to (x, A).
2. If T is a separate partition, corresponding to (x, A), then $j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X H_i \subset T$.

Indeed, (1) $X \setminus j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, U(x) = \big(X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(x)\big) \cup U(x)$, where $x \in U(x) = H_1 \in \tau_j$, $A \subset X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(x) = H_2 \in \tau_j$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$. Similarly for $U(A)$.

(2) Since $(X \setminus T, \tau_1', \tau_2')$ is not j-connected, we have $H_i \in \tau_j' \cap \operatorname{co} \tau_j'$ and hence

$$\begin{gathered} j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, H_i \cap (X \setminus T) = \\ = \big(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} H_i \cap (X \setminus T)\big) \cap \big((X \setminus H_i) \cap (X \setminus T)\big) = \\ = \tau_j' \operatorname{cl} H_i \cap H_j = H_i \cap H_j = \varnothing \end{gathered}$$

so that $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, H_i \subset T$.

Proposition 9.8. *Let (X, τ_1, τ_2) be a* BS *and n denote a nonnegative integer. Then $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \le n$ if and only if to every i-regular pair (x, A) there corresponds a separate partition T such that $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} T \le n-1$.*

Proof. First, let $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \le n$ and (x, A) be an i-regular pair. Then $U(x) = X \setminus A \in \tau_i$ is an i-open neighborhood of x and since $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \le n$, there is a j-open neighborhood $V(x)$ such that

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \ \text{ and } \ (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \le n-1.$$

It follows from (1) of Remark 9.7 that $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x)$ is a separate partition, corresponding to (x, A).

Conversely, let the condition be satisfied, $x \in X$ and $U(x) \in \tau_i$. Then for an i-regular pair $(x, A = X \setminus U(x))$ there is a separate partition T such that $X \setminus T = H_1 \cup H_2$, $H_1, H_2 \in \tau_j \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $x \in H_1$, $A \subset H_2$, $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} T \le n-1$. It is evident that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$ so that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} H_1 \subset X \setminus A = U(x)$. Let $H_1 = V(x)$. Then $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and by (2) Remark 9.7 together with Proposition 9.2, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x)) \le n-1$. □

Definition 9.9. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) and n denote a nonnegative integer. Then

1. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) = -1$ if and only if $X = \varnothing$.
2. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) \le n$ if for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X) \le n-1$($\Longleftrightarrow$ for each point $x \in Y$ and any neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y) \le n-1$).
3. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) = n$ if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) \le n$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) \le n-1$ does not hold.

(4) $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)=\infty$ if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\le n$ does not hold for any n.

As usual,

$$p\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\le n \Longleftrightarrow \big((1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\le n \wedge (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\le n\big).$$

It follows immediately from (2) of Definition 9.9 and (3) of Proposition 2.36 that if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)$ is finite, then Y is (i,j)-separately superregular in X. Hence, by implications after Definition 2.35, Y is (i,j)-strongly separately regular in X, Y is (i,j)-WS-separately superregular in X, Y is (i,j)-separately regular in X, Y is (i,j)-WS-separately regular in X and Y is (i,j)-WS-quasi separately regular in X.

Theorem 9.10. *If* (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *is a* BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2), *then the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}Y\le(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\le(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}X.$
(2) $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(X,X)=(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}X$
(3) *If* $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'')\subseteq(Y,\tau_1',\tau_2')$, *then*

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y)\le(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X)\le(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X).$$

Proof. (1) First, let us prove the left inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n=(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n\le k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. Let $x\in Y$ be any point and $U'(x)\in\tau_i'$ be any neighborhood. If $U(x)\in\tau_i$, $U(x)\cap Y=U'(x)$, then $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)=k$ implies that there is $V(x)\in\tau_j$ such that

$$\tau_j\operatorname{cl}V(x)\subset U(x) \ \text{ and } \ (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y,X\big)\le k-1.$$

Therefore, by inductive assumption, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y)\le k-1$. Moreover, $\tau_j'\operatorname{cl}V'(x)\subset U'(x)$, where $V'(x)=V(x)\cap Y$ and since $j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x)\subseteq j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y$, by Proposition 9.2,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(x))\le k-1.$$

Hence $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}Y\le k$ and so $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}Y\le(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)$.

Now, let us prove the right inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n=(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n\le k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. Let $x\in Y$ be any point and $U(x)\in\tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Since $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}X=k$, there is $V(x)\in\tau_j$ such that $\tau_j\operatorname{cl}V(x)\subset U(x)$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)\big)\le k-1$. Hence, by inductive assumption, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y, j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x))\le k-1$ and by the left inequality, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y)\le k-1$. Hence, by condition (2) in brackets of Definition 9.9, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\le k$ and so $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\le(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}X$.

(2) Follows from (1) for $Y = X$.

(3) First, let us prove the right inequality, i.e., **the monotonicity property of (i,j)- sind(Y,X)** by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Z$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Since $x \in Z \subset Y$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) = k$ there is $V(x) \in \tau_j$ such that

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \ \text{ and } \ (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

But $Z \subset Y$, $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Z \subseteq j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y$ and by inductive assumption

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Z, X\big) \leq$$
$$\leq (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Thus $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X) \leq k$ and so $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X) \leq (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)$.

Finally, let us prove the left inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Z$ be any point and $U'(x) \in \tau'_i$ be any neighborhood. Since $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X) = k$, for $U(x) \in \tau_i$, $U(x) \cap Y = U'(x)$, there is $V(x) \in \tau_j$ such that

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \ \text{ and } \ (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Z, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

If $V'(x) = V(x) \cap Y$, then $\tau'_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U'(x)$. For $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x) \subseteq j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y$ and $Z \subset Y$, we have

$$j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x) \cap Z \subseteq j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Z.$$

Hence, by the right inequality,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x) \cap Z, X\big) \leq$$
$$\leq (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Z, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Therefore, by inductive assumption,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x) \cap Z, Y\big) \leq$$
$$\leq (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x) \cap Z, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Thus $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y) \leq k$ and so $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y) \leq (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X)$. □

Theorem 9.11. *For an i-open* BsS (Y, τ'_1, τ'_2) *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *If* $j\text{-}\operatorname{cl} Z \subset Y$, *then* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X) = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y)$.

(2) $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y$.

Proof. (1) By (3) of Theorem 9.10 it suffices to prove only that $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X) \le (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y)$. Let us prove the inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Z$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Since $Y \in \tau_i$, one can assume that $U(x) \subset Y$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y) = n$ implies that there is $V(x) \in \tau_j$ such that

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \ \text{ and } \ (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x) \cap Z, Y\big) \le k-1.$$

Clearly, $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x) = j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x)$ and since

$$j\text{-}\mathrm{cl}\,\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x) \cap Z\big) \subseteq j\text{-}\mathrm{cl}\, Z \subseteq Y,$$

one can use the inductive assumption under the set $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x) \cap Z$. Hence

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Z, X\big) \le$$
$$\le (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x) \cap Z, Y\big) \le k-1$$

and so $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X) \le k$. Thus $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X) \le (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y)$.

(2) By (1) of Theorem 9.10, it suffices to prove only that

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) \le (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y.$$

We shall use the induction under a nonnegative integer $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y = n$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. If $x \in Y$ is any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ is any neighborhood, then one can assume that $U(x) \subset Y$. Since $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y = k$ and $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x) = j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \subset Y$, where $V(x) \in \tau_j$ and $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$, we have

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x)\big) = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x)\big) \le k-1.$$

By (2) of Theorem 9.10, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,Y) = k$ and therefore, by (2) of Definition 9.9, we have $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x) \cap Y, Y) = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x), Y) \le k-1$. But $j\text{-}\mathrm{cl}\,\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x)\big) = j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \subset Y$ and if we consider in (1) the set $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x)$ instead of Z, we obtain

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X\big) = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x), X\big) =$$
$$= (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V(x), Y\big) \le k-1.$$

Hence, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) \le k$ and so $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) \le (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y$. $\square$

Proposition 9.12. *For a* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *the equality* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) = (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y$ *holds if anyone of the following two conditions is satisfied:*

(1) (X,τ_1,τ_2) *is hereditarily j-normal.*

(2) *(X,τ_1,τ_2) is j-normal, (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) is j-perfectly normal* BsS *of X and $Y\in \operatorname{co}\tau_j$.*

Proof. (1) Since (X,τ_1,τ_2) is hereditarily j-normal, by the proof of the first part of Proposition 1 in [19], if $U'\in\tau'_j$, then there is $U\in\tau_j$ such that $U\cap Y=U'$ and $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,U\cap Y=j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\,U'$.

Now, following (1) of Theorem 9.10 it suffices to prove only that $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\leq(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}Y$ be induction under a nonnegative integer $n=(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}Y$. Let the inequality be proved for $n\leq k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. Since $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}Y=k$, there is $V'(x)\in\tau'_j$ such that $\tau'_j\operatorname{cl}V'(x)\subset U(x)\cap Y$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\,V'(x)\big)\leq k-1$, where $x\in Y$ is any point and $U(x)\in\tau_i$ is any neighborhood. If $V(x)\in\tau_j$, $V(x)\cap Y=V'(x)$ and $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y=j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\,V'(x)$, then

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y\big)\leq k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive hypothesis,

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y,X\big)\leq(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y\big)\leq k-1$$

and so $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\leq k$. Thus $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\leq(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}Y$.

(2) By (1), it suffices to prove only that if $U'\in\tau'_j$, then there is $U\in\tau_j$ such that $U\cap Y=U'$ and $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,U\cap Y=j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\,U'$. But this fact is proved in the first part of the proof of Proposition 2 in [23]. □

Proposition 9.13. *Let (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) be a* BsS *of a* BS *(X,τ_1,τ_2) and $Y=Y_1\cup Y_2$. Then*

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\leq(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1,X)+(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_2,X)+1.$$

Proof. We shall use the induction under a nonnegative integer $n=(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1,X)+(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_2,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n\leq k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. If $x\in Y_1\subset Y$ is any point, then for any $U(x)\in\tau_i$ there is $V(x)\in\tau_j$ such that $\tau_j\operatorname{cl}V(x)\subset U(x)$ and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y_1,X\big)\leq(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1,X)-1.$$

Since

$$j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y=\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y_1\big)\cup\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y_2\big)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y_1,X\big)+(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y_2,X\big)\leq\\ \leq(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1,X)-1+(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_2,X)=k-1,\end{aligned}$$

one can use the inductive assumption under the set $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y$. Hence

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\,V(x)\cap Y,X\big)\leq k-1+1=k$$

and thus $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)\le k+1$. $\square$

Proposition 9.14. *If $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$ is 2-normal and p-normal, $Y\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}Y=0$, then $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X)=0$.*

Proof. We shall prove that for each $x\in Y$ and any $U(x)\in\tau_1$ there is $V(x)\in\tau_2$ such that $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}V(x)\subset U(x)$ and $(\tau_2\operatorname{cl}V(x)\setminus V(x))\cap Y=\varnothing$.

Since $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}Y=0$, there is $V\in\tau_2'\cap\operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ such that $x\in V\subset U(x)\cap Y$. Clearly, $Y\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2$ implies that $V\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $Y\setminus V\in\operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and since (X,τ_1,τ_2) is 2-normal, there are $U(V)\in\tau_2$, $U(Y\setminus V)\in\tau_2$ such that $U(V)\cap U(Y\setminus V)=\varnothing$. Moreover, since X is p-normal and $V\subset U(x)$, by (4) of Definition 1.1, there is $E(V)\in\tau_1$ such that $V\subset E(V)\subset\tau_2\operatorname{cl}E(V)\subset U(x)$. If $W(V)=E(V)\cap U(V)$, then $W(V)\in\tau_2$ as $\tau_1\subset\tau_2$, and

$$V\subset W(V)\subset\tau_2\operatorname{cl}W(V)\subset X\setminus(Y\setminus V)=(X\setminus Y)\cup V$$

since $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}W(V)\subset\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U(V)$ and $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U(V)\cap(Y\setminus V)=\varnothing$. It is clear that $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}W(V)\subset U(x)$ and $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}W(V)\cap Y=\tau_2\operatorname{cl}V=V$. Let $W(V)=V(x)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x)\cap Y&=\big(\tau_2\operatorname{cl}V(x)\setminus V(x)\big)\cap Y=\\&=\big(\tau_2\operatorname{cl}W(V)\setminus W(V)\big)\cap Y=V\setminus V=\varnothing.\end{aligned}$$ $\square$

Theorem 9.15. *If $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$ is $(1,2)$-separately regular, $Y\in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ and $Z\subseteq Y\subseteq X$, then $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y)=(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X)$.*

Proof. By (3) of Theorem 9.10 it suffices to prove only that $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X)\le(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y)$. We shall use the induction under a nonnegative integer $n=(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n\le k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. If $x\in Z$ is any point and $U(x)\in\tau_1$ is any neighborhood, then $k=(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,Y)$ implies that there is $V'(x)\in\tau_2'$ such that $\tau_2'\operatorname{cl}V'(x)\subset U(x)\cap Y$ and

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(x)\cap Z,Y\big)\le k-1.$$

Moreover, by inductive assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(x)\cap Z,X\big)\le\\&\le(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(x)\cap Z,Y\big)\le k-1.\end{aligned}$$

Let $W(x)\in\tau_2$ and $W(x)\cap Y=V'(x)$. Since $V'(x)\subset U(x)$ and $\tau_1\subset\tau_2$, for $V(x)=W(x)\cap U(x)\in\tau_2$ we have $V(x)\subset U(x)$ and $V(x)\cap Y=V'(x)$. Since $Y\in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, by Lemma 2.16 we have

$$\tau_2\operatorname{cl}V(x)=\tau_2\operatorname{cl}(V(x)\cap Y)=\tau_2\operatorname{cl}V'(x).$$

Therefore, $Z \subset Y$ implies that

$$\begin{gathered}
2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Z = \big(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \setminus V(x)\big) \cap Z = \\
= \Big(\big(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \setminus V(x)\big) \cap Y\Big) \cap Z = \Big((\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \setminus V(x)) \cap Y\Big) \cap Z = \\
= \big(\tau_2' \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \setminus V'(x)\big) \cap Z = 2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z.
\end{gathered}$$

Since (X, τ_1, τ_2) is $(1,2)$-separately regular, one can assume that $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$. Hence, for each $x \in Z$ and any $U(x) \in \tau_1$ there is $V(x) \in \tau_2$ such that $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and

$$\begin{gathered}
(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Z, X\big) = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z, X\big) \leq \\
\leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(x) \cap Z, Y\big) \leq k-1.
\end{gathered}$$

Therefore, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z, X) \leq k$ and thus $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z, X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z, Y)$. □

Theorem 9.16. *If* $f : (X, \tau_1 < \tau_2) \to (X_1, \gamma_1 < \gamma_2)$ *is a d-continuous surjection and* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *is a* BsS *of* X *such that the restriction* $f\big|_Y : (Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2') \to (Y_1 = f(Y), \gamma_1' < \gamma_2')$ *is a d-homeomorphism, then* $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1, X_1)$. *Moreover, if* $(X_1, \gamma_1 < \gamma_2)$ *is hereditarily* 2*-normal, then*

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1, X_1) = (1,2)\operatorname{sind} Y.$$

Proof. First, let us prove the inequality

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1, X_1)$$

by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1, X_1)$. Suppose that the inequality is proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $x \in Y$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_1$ be any neighborhood. Since $f\big|_Y$ is a d-homeomorphism, $f(U(x) \cap Y) \in \gamma_1'$.

But $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1, X_1) = k$ and so for a set $U \in \gamma_1$, where $U \cap Y_1 = f(U(x) \cap Y)$, there is a set $W \in \gamma_2$ such that $\gamma_2 \operatorname{cl} W \subset U$ and

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W \cap Y_1, X_1\big) \leq k-1.$$

On the other hand, the set $V(x) = f^{-1}(W) \cap U(x) \in \tau_2$ and it suffices to prove that

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

By the inequality (6) in the proof of Lemma 1 in [24], we have

$$2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y \subseteq f^{-1}(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W) \cap Y = f^{-1}(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W \cap Y_1).$$

Hence, by inductive assumption and (3) of Theorem 9.10,

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1$$

so that $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) \leq k$ and thus

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1,X_1).$$

For the second part, first of all note that since $f\big|_Y$ is a d-homeomorphism, we have $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y_1$. Since (X_1,γ_1,γ_2) is hereditarily 2-normal, by (1) of Proposition 9.12, for a BsS $Y_1 \subset X_1$ we have $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y_1,X_1) = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y_1$. Therefore it remains to prove the equality $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y$, i.e. by (1) of Theorem 9.10, it suffices to prove only that $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y$. We shall use the induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. If $x \in Y$ and $U(x) \in \tau_1$, then there is $V'(x) \in \tau'_2$ such that

$$\tau'_2 \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U(x) \cap Y \ \text{ and } \ (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x)\big) \leq k-1.$$

Since $f\big|_Y$ is a d-homeomorphism, we have $f(V'(x)) \in \gamma'_2$. But the BS (X_1,γ_1,γ_2) is hereditarily 2-normal and by the proof of the first part of Proposition 1 in [23], there is $W \in \gamma_2$ such that

$$W \cap Y_1 = f(V'(x)), \quad 2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{X_1} W \cap Y_1 = 2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_{Y_1} f(V'(x)).$$

Let $V(x) = f^{-1}(W) \cap U(x)$. It is clear that $V(x) \in \tau_2$ and $V(x) \cap Y = V'(x)$. By the proof of Lemma 2 in [24], $2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y = 2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x)$. Therefore, it remains to use the inductive assumption with respect to the set $2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x)$, i.e.,

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X\big) = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x), X\big) \leq$$
$$\leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y\, V'(x)) \leq k-1.$$

Hence $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) \leq k$ and thus $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} Y$. □

Definition 9.17. For a BsS (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) and a relatively i-regular pair (x,A), $x \in Y$, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$, $x \overline{\in} A$, a separate relative partition, corresponding to (x,A), is a j-closed set $T \subset X$ such that $X \setminus T$ is not j-connected and

$$(X \setminus T) \cap Y = Y \setminus T \subset H_1 \cup H_2,$$

where $x \in H'_1 = H_1 \cap Y \in \tau'_j$, $A \subset H_2 \in \tau_j$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$.

Remark 9.18. Let (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) be a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) and (x,A) be a relatively i-regular pair. Then

(1) If there is a neighborhood $U(x) \in \tau_j$ ($U(A) \in \tau_j$) such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(x) \subset X \setminus A$ ($\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(A) \subset X \setminus \{x\}$), then the set $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, U(x)$ ($j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, U(A)$) is a separate relative partition, corresponding to (x,A).

(2) If T is a separate relative partition, corresponding to (x, A), then $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, H_i \subset T$.

The proof is identical to the proof of Remark 9.7.

Proposition 9.19. *Let* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *and* n *denote a nonnegative integer. Then* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) \le n$ *if and only if to every relatively* i*-regular pair* (x, A) *there corresponds a separate relative partition* T *such that* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(T \cap Y, X) \le n-1$.

Proof. First, let $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) \le n$ and (x, A) be a relatively i-regular pair. Then $x \in U(x) = X \setminus A \in \tau_i$ and by (2) of Definition 9.9 there is a neighborhood $V(x) \in \tau_j$ such that

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x) \ \text{ and } \ (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X\big) \le k-1.$$

But by (1) of Remark 9.18, $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x)$ is a separate relative partition, corresponding to (x, A).

Conversely, let us suppose that the condition is satisfied and let us prove that $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) \le n$. Let $x \in Y$ be any point and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Then the pair $(x, A = X \setminus U(x))$ is a relatively i-regular pair and by condition, there is a separate relative partition T for (x, A) such that $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(T \cap Y, X) \le n-1$. But $Y \setminus T \subset H_1 \cup H_2$, where $x \in H_1' \subset H_1 \in \tau_j$, $A \subset H_2 \in \tau_j$, and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$. Clearly,

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} H_1 \subset X \setminus H_2 \subset X \setminus A = U(x).$$

Let $H_1 = V(x)$. Then $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(x) \subset U(x)$ and by (2) of Remark 9.18,

$$j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y = j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, H_1 \cap Y \subset T \cap Y.$$

Since $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(T \cap Y, X) \le n-1$, by (3) of Theorem 9.10, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(x) \cap Y, X) \le n-1$. Thus, it remains to use (2) of Definition 9.9. □

Proposition 9.20. *If a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* (i,j)*-WS-separately superregular in* X *and* j*-extremally disconnected in* X*, then* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) = 0$.

Proof. Let, $x \in Y$ and $U(x) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Then, by (2) of Proposition 2.36, there is $V'(x) \in \tau_j'$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \subset U(x)$, where, by topological version of Definition 2.39, $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(x) \in \tau_j \cap \operatorname{co} \tau_j$. Hence $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V'(x) = \varnothing$ and by (2) of Definition 9.9, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y, X) = 0$. □

10. (i,j)-Large Separate Inductive Dimension Functions and (i,j)-Large Separate Relative Inductive Dimension Functions

Definition 10.1. Let (X,τ_1,τ_2) be a BS and n denote a nonnegative integer. Then

1. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X = -1$ if and only if $X = \varnothing$.
2. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le n$ if for each set $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and any neighborhood $U(F) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(F) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)) \le n-1$.
3. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X = n$ if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le n$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le n-1$ does not hold.
4. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X = \infty$ if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le n$ does not hold for any n.

As usual

$$p\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le n \iff \big((1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le n \wedge (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le n\big).$$

It follows immediately from Proposition 2.29 that if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$ is finite, then (X,τ_1,τ_2) is (i,j)-separately normal.

Proposition 10.2. *If* $(Y,\tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *is a* 2*-closed* BsS *of a* BS $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$, *then* $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$.

Moreover, if $(Y,\tau_1' <_C \tau_2')$ *is a* 1*-closed* BsS *of a* BS $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$, *then* $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$.

Proof. First, let $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $n = (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $U'(F) \in \tau_2'$. Then $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and if $U(F) \in \tau_2$, $U(F)\cap Y = U'(F)$, then $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X = k$ implies that there is $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$ and $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)) \le k-1$. Let $V'(F) = V(F)\cap Y$. Then

$$\tau_1' \operatorname{cl} V'(F) = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V'(F) \cap Y \subset U(F)\cap Y = U'(F)$$

and $1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(F) \subseteq 1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)$. Since $1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(F)$ is 2-closed in $(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F), \tau_1'' < \tau_2'')$, by inductive hypothesis,

$$(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_Y V'(F)\big) \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \le k-1,$$

and hence, $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \le k$ so that $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$.

Now, let us prove that $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$ for $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $n = (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n=k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ and $U'(F) \in \tau_1'$. Then $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ implies that $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$. Let $U(F) \in \tau_1$ and $U(F)\cap Y = U'(F)$. Since $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $U(F) \in \tau_1 \subset \tau_2$ and $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le k$, there is a neighborhood $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$ and

$(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)) \le k-1$. Since $\tau_1' <_C \tau_2'$, by (2) of Corollary 2.2.7 in [8],

$$2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F) = 1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F) \subseteq 1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F),$$

where $V'(F) = V(F) \cap Y$ and as $1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F)$ is 1-closed in $(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F), \tau_1'' < \tau_2'')$, by inductive assumption,

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F)\big) \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \le k-1.$$

Therefore, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$. □

Proposition 10.3. *For an* i-T$_1$ BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *we have*

$$(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind} X \le (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X.$$

Theorem 10.4. *The following inequalities hold for a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$*:* $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le 2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X$ *and* $1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$.

Proof. First, let us prove the right inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $U(F) \in \tau_1$ be any neighborhood. Then $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $U(F) \in \tau_2$ and since $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X = k$, there is $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F) \text{ and } (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \le k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive assumption

$$1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \le k-1.$$

Thus $1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X \le k$ and so $1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$.

Now, let $2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X = n$, the left inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and $U(F) \in \tau_1$ be any neighborhood. Since $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$ and $2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X = k$, there is $V(F) \in \tau_2$ such that $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$ and $2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)) \le k-1$. Hence, by inductive assumption

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \le 2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \le k-1,$$

and so $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le k$. Thus $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \le 2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X$. □

Corollary 10.5. *For a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *we have*

1. *If* $\tau_1 <_C \tau_2$*, then* $1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X \le \min((1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X, (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X)$.
2. *If* $\tau_1 <_N \tau_2$*, then* $1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X \le \min((1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X, (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X)$ *and* $\max((2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X, (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X) \le 2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} X$.

Proof. Follows from Theorem 10.4 taking into account (1) and (2) of Theorem 3.2.38 in [6]. □

Proposition 10.6. *If a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* (i, j)*-separately normal and* j*-extremally disconnected, then* $(i, j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X = 0$.

Proof. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $U(F) \in \tau_i$ be any neighborhood. Then, by Proposition 2.29, there is a neighborhood $V(F) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$. Since X is j-extremally disconnected, $W(F) = \tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(F) \in \tau_j \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ and, hence, $j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X W(F) = \varnothing$. Thus, by (2) of Definition 10.1, $(i, j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X = 0$. ☐

Definition 10.7. Let (A, B) be an i-normal pair in a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2), i.e., A, $B \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Then we say that a j-closed set T is a separate partition, corresponding to the i-normal pair (A, B), if $X \setminus T$ is not j-connected so that $X \setminus T = H_1 \cup H_2$, where H_1, $H_2 \in \tau_j \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $A \subset H_1$, $B \subset H_2$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$.

Remark 10.8. One can easily to verify that in a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) the following conditions are satisfied for an i-normal pair (A, B):

1. If there exists a j-open neighborhood $U(A)$ (j-open neighborhood $U(B)$) such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(A) \subset X \setminus B$ ($\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(B) \subset X \setminus A$), then the set $j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X U(A)$ ($j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X U(B)$) is a separate partition, corresponding to (A, B).
2. If T is a separate partition, corresponding to (A, B), then $j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X H_i \subset T$.

The proof is similar to the proof of Remark 9.7 and can be omitted.

Proposition 10.9. *Let* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *and* n *denote a nonnegative integer. If* $(i, j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \leq n$*, then to every* i*-normal pair* (A, B) *there corresponds a separate partition* T *such that* $(i, j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} T \leq n - 1$.

Proof. Let $(i, j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \leq n$ and (A, B) be an i-normal pair. Then $U(A) = X \setminus B \in \tau_i$ is an i-open neighborhood and since $(i, j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \leq n$, there is $V(A) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(A) \subset U(A)$ and

$$(i, j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(A)\big) \leq n - 1.$$

Thus, it remains to use (1) of Remark 10.8. ☐

Corollary 10.10. *Let* $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *be a* BS *and* n *denote a nonnegative integer. Then* $(2, 1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \leq n$ *if and only if to every* 2*-normal pair* (A, B) *there corresponds a separate partition* T *such that* $(2, 1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} T \leq n - 1$.

Proof. The first part is proved by Proposition 10.9.

Conversely, let the condition is satisfied, $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $U(F) \in \tau_2$. Then for a 2-normal pair $(F, X \setminus U(F))$ there is a separate partition T

such that $X \setminus T = H_1 \cup H_2$, H_1, $H_2 \in \tau_1 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $F \subset H_1$, $X \setminus U(F) \subset H_2$, $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$ and $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} T \leq n-1$. Clearly,

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} H_1 \subset X \setminus (X \setminus U(F)) = U(F).$$

Let $H_1 = V(F)$. Then $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$ and by (2) of Remark 10.8 together with the first part of Proposition 10.2, $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)) \leq n-1$. Thus $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X \leq n$. □

Definition 10.11. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) and n denote a nonnegative integer. Then

1. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) = -1$ if and only if $Y = \varnothing$.
2. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n$ if for any set $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ and any neighborhood $U(F) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(F) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big((j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq n-1$ ($\Longleftrightarrow$ for any set $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ and any neighborhood $U(F) \in \tau_i$ there is a neighborhood $V(F) \in \tau_j$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y) \leq n-1$).
3. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) = n$ if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n-1$ does not hold.
4. $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) = \infty$ if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n$ does not hold for any n.

As usual

$$p\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n \Longleftrightarrow \big((1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n \wedge (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n\big).$$

It follows immediately from (2) of Definition 10.11 and (3) of Proposition 2.31 that if $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$ is finite, then Y is (i,j)-separately supernormal in X. Hence, by implications after Definition 2.30, Y is (i,j)-strongly separately normal in X, Y is (i,j)-WS-separately supernormal in X, Y is (i,j)-separately normal in X, Y is (i,j)-WS-separately normal in X and Y is (i,j)-quasi separately normal in X.

Proposition 10.12. *For an* i-T_1 BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *we have* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Y,X) \leq (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$.

Proposition 10.13. *If* $(Z, \tau_1'' < \tau_2'') \subset (Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *and* $Z \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$, *then* $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}(Z,X) \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$.

Proof. Let us prove **the monotonicity property of (2,1)- sInd(Y,X)** by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2''$ and $U(F) \in \tau_2$. Then $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and since $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) = k$, there is $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F) \ \text{ and } \ (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Since 1-$\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Z$ is 2-closed in (1-$\mathrm{Fr}_X(V(F) \cap Y, \tau_1'' < \tau_2'')$, by inductive assumption,

$$\begin{aligned}&(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Z, X\big) \leq \\ &\leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1 \ \text{ and so}\end{aligned}$$

$(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Z,X) \leq k$. Thus $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Z,X) \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$. ☐

Theorem 10.14. *For a* BsS $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *the following inequalities hold:*

(1) $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq 2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$, $i\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$ *and hence,*

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq 2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X).$$

Moreover, if $\tau_1 <_C \tau_2$, *then in addition, we have:*

(2) $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq 1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$ *and hence*

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq i\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X).$$

Proof. (1) First, let us prove the left inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = 2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ and $U(F) \in \tau_1$ be any neighborhood. Since $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$, we have $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$, $U(F) \in \tau_2$ and by $2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) = k$ there is $V(F) \in \tau_2$ such that

$$\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F) \ \text{ and } \ 2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive assumption,

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq 2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1$$

so that $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq k$ and thus $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq 2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$.

Now, let $n = (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$, the right inequality $1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$ be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $U(F) \in \tau_1$. Then $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$, $U(F) \in \tau_2$ and since $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) = k$, there is $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$ and $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1$. Hence, by inductive hypothesis

$$1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Therefore $1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) \leq k$ and so $1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) \leq (2,1)\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$.

Furthermore, for a nonnegative integer $n = (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$ let us prove the inequality $2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) \leq (2,1)\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$,

$U(F) \in \tau_2$. Then $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) = k$ implies that there is $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F) \ \text{ and } \ (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \le k-1.$$

Since $2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \subset 1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)$, the set $2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y$ is 2-closed in $1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y$ and by Proposition 10.13, $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X) \le k-1$. Hence, by inductive assumption, $2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X) \le k-1$. Since $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$, we have $2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) \le k$ and thus $2\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$.

(2) Let $\tau_1 <_C \tau_2$ and use the induction under $n = 1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$. Suppose that the inequality is proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. If $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$, $U(F) \in \tau_1$, then $1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) = k$ implies that there is $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F) \ \text{ and } \ 1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \le k-1.$$

Since $V(F) \in \tau_1$, by (2) of Corollary 2.2.7 in [8], $1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) = 2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F)$ and so $1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}\big(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \le k-1$. Therefore, by inductive assumption $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \le k-1$. Since $V(F) \in \tau_1 \subset \tau_2$ and $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F)$, we have $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \le k$. Thus $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \le 1\text{-}\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X)$. ☐

Corollary 10.15. *For a* BsS $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *we have* $i\text{-}\operatorname{Ind} Y \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$.

Proof. Follows directly from (1) of Corollary 8.6 and (1) of Theorem 10.14. ☐

Theorem 10.16. *Let* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *be a* BsS *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$. *Then* $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$. *Moreover, if* $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, *then* $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$ *and thus* $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(X,X) = (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$.

Proof. We shall prove the inequality $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$ by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $U'(F) \in \tau_2'$ be any neighborhood. Then there is $U(F) \in \tau_2$ such that $U(F) \cap Y = U'(F)$. Since $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) = k$, there is $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F) \ \text{ and } \ (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \le k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive assumption, $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y) \le k-1$. Since $1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F)$ is 1-closed and, hence, 2-closed in $1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y$, where $V'(F) = V(F) \cap Y$, by Proposition 10.2,

$$(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F)\big) \le (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y\big) \le k-1.$$

Thus $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \leq k$ and so $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$.

Now, let $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$, $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X = n$, the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2' \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ and $U(F) \in \tau_2$. Since $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X = k$, there is $V(F) \in \tau_1$ such that

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F) \text{ and } (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \leq k-1.$$

Therefore, by inductive assumption,

$$(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sind}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, 1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \leq k-1$$

and by the first inequality of this theorem, $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y\big) \leq k-1$. Hence, by the condition in brackets in (2) of Definition 10.11, $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq k$ and thus $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$.

Finally, it is evident that $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(X,X) = (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$. □

Recall that by Definition 2.3.15 in [8], a topology τ_1 is i-strongly near a topology τ_2 on a set X (briefly, $\tau_1 N(i) \tau_2$) if the N relation is hereditary with respect to i-closed subsets of X.

Theorem 10.17. *If* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *is a* 1*-closed* BsS *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 <_{N(1)} \tau_2)$, *then* $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$ *and thus* $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(X,X) = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$.

Proof. First, let us prove the right inequality. As usual, we shall use the induction under $n = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$ and $U(F) \in \tau_1$. Then $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and since $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X = k$, there is $V(F) \in \tau_2$ such that

$$\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F) \text{ and } (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \leq k-1.$$

Since $\tau_1 <_{N(1)} \tau_2$, by (2) of Corollary 2.3.12 in [8], $2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) = 1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)$. Clearly $1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ and by Corollary 2.3.10 in [8], $\tau_1 <_{N(1)} \tau_2$ implies that $\tau_1 <_{C(1)} \tau_2$. Hence, $1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ implies that $\tau_1'' <_C \tau_2''$ in $(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, \tau_1'' < \tau_2'')$ and since $1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y$ is 1-closed in $2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)$, by the second part of Proposition 10.2,

$$(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y\big) = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y\big) \leq$$
$$\leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(2\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F)\big) \leq k-1.$$

Therefore, by the condition in brackets in (2) of Definition 10.11, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq k$ and so, $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$.

Now, we shall prove the left inequality by induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$. Let the inequality be proved for $n \leq k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. Suppose that $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1'$,

$U'(F) \in \tau_1'$ and $U(F) \in \tau_1$ such that $U(F) \cap Y = U'(F)$. Since $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) = k$, there is $V(F) \in \tau_2$ such that

$$\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} V(F) \subset U(F) \text{ and } (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y, X\big) \leq k-1.$$

Hence, by inductive hypothesis $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y) \leq k-1$. Since $\tau_1 <_{N(1)} \tau_2$ and $Y \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1$, we have

$$2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) = 1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \text{ and } 2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F) = 1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F),$$

where $V'(F) = V(F) \cap Y$. But $1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F)$ is 1-closed in $1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y$, and since $\tau_1 <_{N(1)} \tau_2$ implies $\tau_1 <_{C(1)} \tau_2$, by the second part of Proposition 10.2,

$$\begin{aligned}(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_Y V'(F)\big) &\leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y\big) = \\ &= (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(2\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V(F) \cap Y\big) \leq k-1.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \leq k$ and so $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} Y \leq (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X)$. Finally, for $\tau_1 <_{N(1)} \tau_2$ it is evident that $(1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(X,X) = (1,2)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd} X$. $\square$

Definition 10.18. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then a pair (A,B), where $A \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i'$, $B \in \operatorname{co} \tau_i$ and $A \cap B = \varnothing$, is said to be a separate relatively i-normal pair. A separate relative partition, corresponding to (A,B), is a j-closed set $T \subset X$ such that $X \setminus T$ is not j-connected and

$$(X \setminus T) \cap Y = Y \setminus T \subset H_1 \cup H_2,$$

where $A \subset H_i' = H_i \cap Y \in \tau_j'$, $B \subset H_j \in \tau_j$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$.

Remark 10.19. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) and (A,B) be a separate relatively i-normal pair. Then

1. If there is a neighborhood $U(A) \in \tau_j$ ($U(B) \in \tau_j$) such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(A) \subset X \setminus B$ ($\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(B) \subset X \setminus A$), then the set $j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X U(A)$ ($j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X U(B)$) is a separate relative partition, corresponding to (A,B).
2. If T is a separate relative partition, corresponding to (A,B), then $j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X H_i \subset T$.

Indeed, (1) Let us prove the case in brackets. We have:

$$X \setminus j\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X U(B) = \big(X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(B)\big) \cup U(B),$$

where $A \subset H_i' = (X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U(B)) \cap Y \in \tau_j'$, $B \subset U(B) = H_j \in \tau_j$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$.

(2) Since $(X \setminus T, \tau_1'', \tau_2'')$ is not j-connected, i.e., $X \setminus T = H_1 \cup H_2$, $H_i \in \tau_j \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$, $A \subset H_i' = H_i \cap Y$ and $B \subset H_j$, we have

$$j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, H_i \cap (X \setminus T) = (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} H_i \setminus H_i) \cap (X \setminus T) = \varnothing.$$

Thus $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, H_i \subset T$.

Proposition 10.20. *Let* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *and* n *denote a nonnegative integer. If* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y, X) \leq n$*, then to every separate relatively* i*-normal pair* (A, B) *there corresponds a separate relative partition* T *such that* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(T \cap Y, X) \leq n-1$.

Proof. Let $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n$ and (A,B) be a separate relatively i-normal pair. Then $U(A) = X \setminus B \in \tau_i$ and since $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n$, there is $V(A) \in \tau_j$ such that

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V(A) \subset U(A) \ \text{ and } \ (i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(A) \cap Y, X\big) \leq n-1.$$

Thus, it remains to use (1) of Remark 10.19. □

Corollary 10.21. *Let* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *be a* BsS *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *and* n *denote a nonnegative integer. Then* $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n$ *if and only if to every separate relatively* 2*-normal pair* (A,B) *there corresponds a separate relative partition* T *such that* $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(T \cap Y, X) \leq n-1$.

Proof. The proof of the first part is given by Proposition 10.20.

Conversely, let us suppose that the condition is satisfied, $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2'$ and $U(A) \in \tau_2$. Then $(A, B = X \setminus U(A))$ is a separate relatively 2-normal pair and, by condition, there is a separate relative partition T, corresponding to (A,B), such that $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(T \cap Y, X) \leq n-1$. But $Y \setminus T \subset H_1 \cup H_2$, where $A \subset H_i' = H_i \cap Y \in \tau_1'$, $B \subset H_j \in \tau_1$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \varnothing$. Clearly,

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} H_i \subset X \setminus H_j \subset X \setminus B = U(A) \in \tau_2.$$

Let $H_i = V(A)$. Then $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} V(A) \subset U(A)$ and by (2) of Remark 10.19,

$$1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(A) \cap Y = 1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, H_i \cap Y \subset T \cap Y.$$

Since $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(T \cap Y, X) \leq n-1$ and $1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(A) \cap Y$ is 1-closed and so, 2-closed in $T \cap Y$, by Proposition 10.13,

$$(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}\big(1\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X\, V(A) \cap Y, X\big) \leq (2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(T \cap Y, X) \leq n-1$$

so that $(2,1)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) \leq n$. □

Proposition 10.22. *If a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *is* (i,j)-WS*-separately supernormal in* X *and* j*-extremally disconnected in* X*, then* $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) = 0$.

Proof. Let $F \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ and $U(F) \in \tau_i$. Then, by (2) of Proposition 2.31, there is $V'(F) \in \tau_j'$ such that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(F) \subset U(x)$, where by topological version of Definition 2.39, $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} V'(F) = V(F) \in \tau_j \cap \operatorname{co}\tau_j$, so that $j\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(F) = \varnothing$. Therefore, by (2) of Definition 10.11, $(i,j)\text{-}\operatorname{sInd}(Y,X) = 0$. □

11. (i,j)-Relative Covering Dimension Functions

Definition 11.1. Let (Y,τ_1',τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) and n denote a nonnegative integer. Then

1. (1) $(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X) = -1$ if and only if $Y = \varnothing$.
2. (2) $(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X) \le n$ if every family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{U_s\}_{s\in S} \subset \tau_i$ for which there is a family of sets $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} = \{F_t\}_{t\in T} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_j'$ which refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$, can be refined by a family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{V_r\}_{r\in R} \subset \tau_i$ such that the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}$ also refines the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\operatorname{ord}\{(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V_r \cap Y\}_{r\in R} \le n$.
3. (3) $(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X) = n$ if $(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X) \le n$ and $(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X) \le n-1$ is false.
4. (4) $(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X) = \infty$ if $(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X) \le n$ is false for all n.

As usual,

$$p\text{-}\dim(Y,X) \le n \Longleftrightarrow \big((1,2)\text{-}\dim(Y,X) \le n \wedge (2,1)\text{-}\dim(Y,X) \le n\big).$$

Clearly, for the topological case we have

Definition 11.2. Let (Y,τ') be a TsS of a TS (X,τ) and n denote a nonnegative integer. Then

1. (1) $\dim(Y,X) = -1$ if and only if $Y = \varnothing$.
2. (2) $\dim(Y,X) \le n$ if every family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{U_s\}_{s\in S} \subset \tau$ for which there is a family of sets $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} = \{F_t\}_{t\in T} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau'$ which refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$, can be refined by a family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{V_r\}_{r\in R} \subset \tau$ such that the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}$ also refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\operatorname{ord}\{\mathrm{Fr}_X V_r \cap Y\}_{r\in R} \le n$.
3. (3) $\dim(Y,X) = n$ if $\dim(Y,X) \le n$ and $\dim(Y,X) \le n-1$ is false.
4. (4) $\dim(Y,X) = \infty$ if $\dim(Y,X) \le n$ is false for all n.

Proposition 11.3. *If $(Y,\tau_1''',\tau_2''') \subset (Y_1,\tau_1'',\tau_2'') \subset (X_1,\tau_1',\tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$, $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j''$ and $X_1 \in \tau_i$, then*

$$(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X) \le (i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y_1,X_1).$$

Proof. We shall use the induction under a nonnegative integer $n = (i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y_1,X_1)$. Let us suppose that the inequality is proved for $n \le k-1$ and prove it for $n = k$. If $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} = \{U_s\}_{s\in S} \subset \tau_i$ is a family for which there is a family of sets $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} = \{F_t\}_{t\in T} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_j'''$ which refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$, then it is evident that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \cap X_1 = \{U_s \cap X_1\}_{s\in S} \subset \tau_i'$ is a family of subsets of X_1 such that the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}$ also refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \cap X_1$. It follows from $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j''$ that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}} \subset \operatorname{co}\tau_j''$ and since (i,j)-$\dim(Y_1, X_1) = k$, there is a family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \{V_r\}_{r\in R} \subset \tau_i'$ such that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}} \cap X_1$ and $\operatorname{ord}\{(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_{X_1} V_r \cap Y_1\}_{r\in R} \le k$. Since $Y \subset Y_1 \subset X_1 \subset X$, it is clear, that

$$(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_{X_1} V_r \cap Y_1 = (j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_{X} V_r \cap Y_1$$

and

$$(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_{X} V_r \cap Y \subset (j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_{X} V_r \cap Y_1$$

for each $r \in R$. Besides, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ also refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$, $X_1 \in \tau_i$ implies that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} \subset \tau_i$ and

$$\operatorname{ord}\big\{(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V_r \cap Y\big\}_{r\in R} \le$$
$$\le \operatorname{ord}\big\{(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_X V_r \cap Y_1\big\}_{r\in R} = \operatorname{ord}\big\{(j,i)\text{-}\operatorname{Fr}_{X_1} \cap Y_1\big\}_{r\in R} \le k.$$

Thus (i,j)-$\dim(Y,X) \le k$ so that (i,j)-$\dim(Y,X) \le (i,j)$-$\dim(Y_1, X_1)$. □

Corollary 11.4. *If* $(Y,\tau''') \subset (Y_1,\tau'') \subset (X_1,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$, $Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau''$ *and* $X_1 \in \tau$, *then* $\dim(Y,X) \le \dim(Y_1,X_1)$.

Corollary 11.5. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'') \subset (Y,\tau_1',\tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ *and* $Y \in \tau_i$, *then* (i,j)-$\dim(Z,X) \le (i,j)$-$\dim(Z,Y)$ (***the anti-monotonicity of the relative bitopological covering dimension functions***).

If, in addition, $Z \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j'$, *then* (i,j)-$\dim(Z,X) \le (i,j)$-$\dim Y$, *where* (i,j)-$\dim Y$ *is considered in the sense of Definition* 3.3.1 *in* [8].

Proof. For the first inequality let us suppose in Proposition 11.3 that $Y = Y_1 = Z$ and $X_1 = Y$, and for the second inequality – that $Y = Z$ and $Y_1 = X_1 = Y$. □

Corollary 11.6. *If* $(Z,\tau'') \subset (Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$ *and* $Y \in \tau$, *then* $\dim(Z,X) \le \dim(Z,Y)$ (***the anti-monotonicity of the relative topological covering dimension***).

If, in addition, $Z \in \operatorname{co}\tau'$, *then* $\dim(Z,X) \le \dim Y$.

Theorem 11.7. *The equalities* (i,j)-$\dim(Y,X) = 0$ *and* (i,j)-$\operatorname{Ind}(Y,X) = 0$ *are equivalent for every* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *and either of them yields the (i,j)-supernormality of Y in X together with other notions of relative bitopological normality.*

Proof. We begin by assuming that (i,j)-$\dim(Y,X) = 0$ for a BsS Y of a BS X. Let $A \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j'$ and $U(A) \in \tau_i$. Since (i,j)-$\dim(Y,X) = 0$, there is

$V(A)\in\tau_i$ such that $F\subset V(A)\subset U(A)$ and $\operatorname{ord}\big((j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A)\cap Y\big)\leq 0$. Hence $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V(A)\cap Y=\varnothing$ and by Remark 8.2, $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)=0$.

Conversely, let $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)=0$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}=\{U_s\}_{s\in S}\subset\tau_i$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}=\{F_t\}_{t\in T}\subset\operatorname{co}\tau'_j$ be families such that $F_{t(s)}\subset U_s$ for each $s\in S$. Since $(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)=0$, for each $s\in S$ there $V_s\in\tau_i$ such that $F_{t(s)}\subset V_s\subset\tau_j\operatorname{cl}V_s\subset U_s$ (i.e., the family $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}=\{V_s\}_{s\in S}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}$ refines $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$) and $(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V_s\cap Y=\varnothing$. Hence,

$$\operatorname{ord}\big\{(j,i)\text{-}\mathrm{Fr}_X V_s\cap Y\big\}_{s\in S}=-1$$

so that $(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X)\leq 0$. But $Y\neq\varnothing$ and so $(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X)=0$. $\square$

For the rest see the notice between Definition 8.1 and Remark 8.2.

Corollary 11.8. *The equalities* $\dim(Y,X)=0$ *and* $\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)=0$ *are equivalent for every* TsS (Y,τ') *of a* TS (X,τ) *and either of them yields the supernormality of* Y *in* X *together with other notions of relative topological normality.*

Corollary 11.9. *The following conditions are satisfied for any* BsS (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2)*:*

(1) $p\text{-}\dim(Y,X)=0\iff p\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)$ *and either of them yields the* p*-supernormality of* Y *in* X *together with other notions of relative bitopological "absolute" normality.*

(2) *If* (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) *is a* j-T_1 BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2)*, then*

$$(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X)=0\ \big(\iff(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)=0\big)\implies(i,j)\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)=0$$

so that if (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) *is a* R-p-T_1 BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2)*, then*

$$p\text{-}\dim(Y,X)=0\ \big(\iff p\text{-}\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)=0\big)\implies p\text{-}\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)=0.$$

Proof. Follows directly from Theorem 11.7 and Proposition 8.4. $\square$

Corollary 11.10. *If* (Y,τ') *is a* T_1 TsS *of a* TS (X,τ)*, then*

$$\dim(Y,X)=0\ \big(\iff\mathrm{Ind}(Y,X)=0\big)\implies\mathrm{ind}(Y,X)=0.$$

Corollary 11.11. *If* (Y,τ'_1,τ'_2) *is a* (j,i)-WS-*supernormal* BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *and* Y *is* (i,j)*-extremally disconnected in* X*, then* $(i,j)\text{-}\dim(Y,X)=0$.

Proof. The condition is an immediate consequence of Theorem 11.7 and Proposition 8.11. $\square$

Corollary 11.12. *If* (Y,τ') *is* WS-*supernormal* TsS *of a* TS (X,τ) *and* Y *is extremally disconnected in* X*, then* $\dim(Y,X)=0$.

In the last Section 12 we introduce and study relative versions of Baire spaces for both the topological and the bitopological case.

12. Relative Baire Spaces and Relative (i,j)-Baire Spaces

A TS (X,τ) is said to have the Baire property if any first category subset of X has an empty interior in (X,τ) and a Baire space is a TS such that every nonempty open set is of second category. A brief but cognitive story of the origin and development of the theory of Baire spaces as well as of its applications can be found in [15]. Most of the results on Baire spaces are stated in [12]. The bitopological versions of Baire spaces are introduced and studied, in particular, in [7], [8] and [1].

Definition 12.1. Let (Y,τ_1',τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2). Then a subset $A\subset X$ is said to be (i,j)-nowhere dense ((i,j)-somewhere dense) relative to Y if $\tau_i'\operatorname{int}(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y)=\varnothing$ ($\tau_i'\operatorname{int}(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y)\neq\varnothing$).

The families of all subsets of X which are (i,j)-nowhere dense ((i,j)-somewhere dense) relative to Y are denoted by (i,j)-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ ((i,j)-$\mathcal{SD}(Y,X)$).

The bitopological counterparts of these families are introduced and studied in [8].

Definition 12.2. Let (Y,τ') be a TsS of a TS (X,τ). Then a subset $A\subset X$ is said to be nowhere dense (somewhere dense) relative to Y if $\tau'\operatorname{int}(\tau\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y)=\varnothing$ ($\tau'\operatorname{int}(\tau\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y)\neq\varnothing$).

The family of all subsets of X which are nowhere dense (somewhere dense) relative to Y is denoted by $\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ ($\mathcal{SD}(Y,X)$).

Of considerable importance later on is

Proposition 12.3. *For a* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *and a subset* $A\subset X$ *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ *if and only if*

$$\tau_j\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y\subset\tau_i'\operatorname{cl}\big(Y\setminus(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y)\big).$$

(2) *If* $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$, *then for any set* $U'\in(\tau_1'\cap\tau_2')\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ *there is a set* $V\in\tau_j\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ *such that* $V\cap Y\subset U'$ *and* $V\cap A=\varnothing$.

(3) *If for any set* $U'\in\tau_i'\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ *there is a set* $V\in\tau_j\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ *such that* $V\cap Y\subset U'$ *and* $V\cap A=\varnothing$, *then* $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.

Proof. (1) If $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$, then

$$Y=Y\setminus\tau_i'\operatorname{int}(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y)=\tau_i'\operatorname{cl}\big(Y\setminus(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y)\big)$$

and, conversely, if

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y \subset \tau_i' \operatorname{cl}\big(Y \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)\big) = Y \setminus \tau_i' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y),$$

then

$$\varnothing = (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \cap \tau_i' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) = \tau_i' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y).$$

(2) If $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ and $U' \in (\tau_1' \cap \tau_2') \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ is an arbitrary set, then $U' \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \neq \varnothing$, since the contrary means that

$$\varnothing = U' \cap \big(X \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)\big) = U' \cap \big(Y \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)\big),$$

i.e.,

$$\varnothing = U' \cap \tau_i' \operatorname{cl}\big(Y \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)\big) = U' \setminus \varnothing = U'.$$

Let $V = U \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} A$, where $U \cap Y = U'$, $U \in \tau_j$. Then

$$V \cap Y = (U \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{cl} A) \cap Y = U' \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \subset U'$$

and $V \cap A = \varnothing$.

(3) If $A \overline{\in} (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$, i.e., if $\tau_i' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \neq \varnothing$, then for any set $V \in \tau_j \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that $V \cap Y \subset \tau_i' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)$, we have $V \cap Y \subset (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)$ so that $V \cap \tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \neq \varnothing$. Hence $V \cap A \neq \varnothing$. $\square$

Corollary 12.4. *If* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *is a* BsS *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$*, then the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) & \subset & 1\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \\ \bigcap & & \bigcap \\ 2\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) & \subset & (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \end{array}$$

and hence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Y,X) & \subset & 1\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Y,X) \\ \bigcap & & \bigcap \\ 2\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Y,X) & \subset & (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Y,X). \end{array}$$

(2) $A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ *if and only if for each set* $U' \in \tau_1' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ *there is a set* $V \in \tau_2 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ *such that* $V \cap Y \subset U'$ *and* $V \cap A = \varnothing$.

(3) *If* $A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$*, then for any set* $U' \in \tau_2' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ *such that* $\tau_1' \operatorname{int} U' \neq \varnothing$ *there is a set* $V \in \tau_1 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ *such that* $V \cap Y \subset U'$ *and* $V \cap A = \varnothing$.

(4) *If for any set* $U' \in \tau_2' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ *there is a set* $V \in \tau_1 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ *such that* $V \cap Y \subset U'$ *and* $V \cap A = \varnothing$*, then* $A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.

Proof. (1) The inclusions are evident.

(2) The condition is an immediate consequence of (2) and (3) of Proposition 12.3.

(3) Let $U' \in \tau_2' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ and $\tau_1' \operatorname{int} U' \neq \varnothing$. Then $\tau_1' \operatorname{int} U' \setminus (\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \neq \varnothing$, since the contrary means that

$$\begin{aligned} \varnothing &= \tau_1' \operatorname{int} U' \cap \big(Y \setminus \tau_1' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)\big) = \\ &= \tau_1' \operatorname{int} U' \setminus \tau_1' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) = \tau_1' \operatorname{int} U' \setminus \varnothing = \tau_1' \operatorname{int} U', \end{aligned}$$

where the equality $\tau_1' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) = \varnothing$ is conditioned by inclusion $(2,1)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \subset 1$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$. Now, it is clear that the set $V = W \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$, where $W \in \tau_1$, $W \cap Y = \tau_1' \operatorname{int} U'$, is the required set.

(4) Follows directly from (3) of Proposition 12.3. $\square$

Corollary 12.5. *If (Y,τ') is a* TsS *of a* TS (X,τ), *then $A \in \mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ if and only if for any set $U' \in \tau' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ there is a set $V \in \tau \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that $V \cap Y \subset U'$ and $V \cap A = \varnothing$.*

Definition 12.6. Let (Y,τ_1',τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2). Then a subset $A \subset X$ is said to be (i,j)-boundary ((i,j)-dense) relative to Y if $\tau_i' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{int} A \cap Y) = \varnothing$ ($\tau_i' \operatorname{cl}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) = Y$).

The families of all subsets of X which are (i,j)-boundary ((i,j)-dense) relative to Y are denoted by (i,j)-$\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ ((i,j)-$\mathcal{D}(X,Y)$). Evidently

$$\begin{gathered} \tau_i' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{int} A \cap Y) = \varnothing \iff Y = Y \setminus \tau_i' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{int} A \cap Y) = \\ = \tau_i' \operatorname{cl}\big(Y \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{int} A \cap Y)\big) = \tau_i' \operatorname{cl}\big((X \setminus \tau_j \operatorname{int} A) \cap Y\big) = \\ = \tau_i' \operatorname{cl}\big(\tau_j \operatorname{cl}(X \setminus A) \cap Y\big) \end{gathered}$$

so that $A \in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{B}d(Y,X) \iff X \setminus A \in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$.

Definition 12.7. Let (Y,τ') be a TsS of a TS (X,τ). Then a subset $A \subset X$ is said to be boundary (dense) relative to Y if $\tau \operatorname{int} A \cap Y = \varnothing$ ($\tau \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y = Y$).

The family of all subsets of X which are boundary (dense) relative to Y is denoted by $\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ ($\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$). Clearly, $A \in \mathcal{B}d(Y,X) \iff X \setminus A \in \mathcal{D}(Y,X)$.

Remark 12.8. In contrast to the usual case, when $A \in \mathcal{ND}(X) \iff \tau \operatorname{cl} A \in \mathcal{B}d(X)$, for the relative case $A \in \mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \implies \tau \operatorname{cl} A \in \mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$, but not conversely as shows the following elementary example: $X = \{a,b,c,d,e,f\}$, $\tau = \{\varnothing, \{a\}, \{a,b\}, \{c,d,e\}, \{a,c,d,e\}, \{a,b,c,d,e\}, \{a,c,d,e,f\}, X\}$, $Y = \{f\}$ and $A = \{a,b\}$. Then $\tau \operatorname{cl} A \in \mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$, but $A \overline{\in} \mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.

The following simple but useful notions are employed frequently below.

Definition 12.9. Let (Y,τ_1',τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2). Then a subset $A\subset X$ is i-strongly boundary (i-strongly dense) relative to Y if $\tau_i'\operatorname{int}(A\cap Y)=\varnothing$ ($\tau_i'\operatorname{cl}(A\cap Y)=Y$).

The families of all subsets of X which are i-strongly boundary (i-strongly dense) relative to Y are denoted by i-$s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ (i-$s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$).

Therefore,

$$\begin{gathered}A\in i\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)\iff A\cap Y\in i\text{-}\mathcal{B}d(Y),\\ A\in i\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)\iff A\cap Y\in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(Y),\\ A\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)\iff \tau_j\operatorname{cl}A\in i\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)\end{gathered}$$

and

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)\subset i\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)\subset(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{B}d(Y,X).$$

Hence, if (Y,τ') is a TsS of a TS (X,τ), then

$$\begin{gathered}A\in s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)\iff A\cap Y\in\mathcal{B}d(Y),\\ A\in s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)\iff A\cap Y\in\mathcal{D}(Y),\\ A\in\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)\iff \tau\operatorname{cl}A\in s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)\end{gathered}$$

and $\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)\subset s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)\subset\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$.

Proposition 12.10. *If $(Y,\tau_1'<\tau_2')$ is a* BsS *of a* BS $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$, $A\in j$-$s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ *and* $B\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$, *then* $A\cup B\in 1$-$s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$.

Proof. Since $\tau_j'\operatorname{cl}(B\cap Y)\subset\tau_j\operatorname{cl}B\cap Y$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&Y\setminus(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}B\cap Y)=\tau_j'\operatorname{cl}(Y\setminus(A\cap Y))\setminus(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}B\cap Y)\subset\\ &\subset\tau_j'\operatorname{cl}(Y\setminus(A\cap Y))\setminus\tau_j'\operatorname{cl}(B\cap Y)\subset\tau_j'\operatorname{cl}(Y\setminus(A\cup B)).\end{aligned}$$

Since $B\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$, by (2) of Lemma 0.2.1 in [8],

$$\begin{aligned}Y&=Y\setminus\tau_i'\operatorname{int}(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}B\cap Y)=\\ &=\tau_i'\operatorname{cl}\big(Y\setminus(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}B\cap Y)\big)\subset\tau_i'\operatorname{cl}\tau_j'\operatorname{cl}(Y\setminus(A\cup B))=\\ &=\tau_1'\operatorname{cl}(Y\setminus(A\cup B))=\tau_1'\operatorname{cl}\big((Y\setminus(A\cup B)\cap Y)\big).\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\tau_1'\operatorname{int}((A\cup B)\cap Y)=\varnothing$, i.e., $A\cup B\in 1$-$s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$. □

Corollary 12.11. *If (Y,τ') is a* TsS *of a* TS (X,τ), $A\in s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ *and* $B\in\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$, *then* $A\cup B\in s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$.

Corollary 12.12. *If $(Y,\tau_1'<\tau_2')$ is a* BsS *of a* BS $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$ *and* $A\in 2$-$s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$, *then* $A\cup B\in 1$-$s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ *if anyone of the following conditions is satisfied:*

(1) $B\in(2,1)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.
(2) $B\in 1$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.
(3) $B\in 2$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.

(4) $B \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.

Proof. Follows directly from Proposition 12.10 taking into account (1) of Corollary 12.4. $\square$

Corollary 12.13. *For a* BsS $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) $A,\ B \in i\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow A \cup B \in i\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \subset (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.
(2) $A \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X),\ B \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow A \cup B \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \subset (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.
(3) $A \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X),\ B \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow A \cup B \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.
(4) $A \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X),\ B \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow A \cup B \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \subset (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.
(5) $A,\ B \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow A \cup B \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \subset 1\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \cap 2\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \subset (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.
(6) $A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X),\ B \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow A \cup B \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.

Proof. (1) $A \in i\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow \tau_i \operatorname{cl} A \in i\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ and $B \in i\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow \tau_i \operatorname{cl} B \in i\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$. Hence, by Corollary 12.11, $\tau_i \operatorname{cl} A \cup \tau_i \operatorname{cl} B = \tau_i \operatorname{cl}(A \cup B) \in i\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ so that $A \cup B \in i\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$. The inclusion follows from (1) of Corollary 12.4.

(2) By (1) of Corollary 12.4, $(2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \subset 1\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ and hence, it remains to use (1) above for $i = 1$.

(3) $A \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} A \in 2\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ and $B \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$. Therefore, by (4) it Corollary 12.12, $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} A \cup \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(A \cup B) \in 1\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ so that $A \cup B \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.

(4) By (1) of Corollary 12.4, $(2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X) \subset 2\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ and thus, it remains to use (1) above for $i = 2$.

(5) We have $\tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) = \varnothing = \tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} B \cap Y)$. Then $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \in 2\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ and (2) of Lemma 0.2.1 in [8], $\tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} B \cap Y) = \tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} B \cap Y) = \varnothing$ so that $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} B \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$. Hence, by Corollary 12.11, $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cup \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} B \in 2\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$. Since $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cup \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} B = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(A \cup B) \in \operatorname{co} \tau_1$, we have $A \cup B \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$.

The rest follows from (1) of Corollary 12.4.

(6) Follows directly from (3) above and (1) of Corollary 12.4. $\square$

Definition 12.14. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then a subset $A \subset X$ is said to be an $i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma$-set ($i\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta$-set) relative to Y, if

$A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ ($A = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$) and $A_n \cap Y \in \operatorname{co}\tau_i'$ ($A_n \cap Y \in \tau_i'$) for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$.

The families of all subsets of X which are i-$\mathcal{F}_\sigma$ (i-$\mathcal{G}_\delta$) relative to Y, are denoted by i-$\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y, X)$ (i-$\mathcal{G}_\delta(Y, X)$).

Therefore, $A \in i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y, X) \iff A \cap Y \in i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y)$ and

$$A \in i\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(Y, X) \iff A \cap Y \in i\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(Y).$$

It is evident that $i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X) \subset i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y, X)$ ($i\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \subset i\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(Y, X)$) for any $Y \subset X$ and

$$A \in i\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y, X) \iff X \setminus A \in i\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(Y, X).$$

The topological case is obvious and the notions above are of independent interest which is not our objective at the present time. Note only here, that by analogy with Lemma 2.21 one can prove that if $(Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, Y is p-supernormal in X, $P \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y, X)$, $Q \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(Y, X)$ and $(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} P \cap Q) \cup (P \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} Q) = \varnothing$, then there are disjoint sets $U \in \tau_2$, $V \in \tau_1$ such that $P \cap Y \subset U$, $Q \cap Y \subset V$.

Definition 12.15. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') be a BsS of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). Then a subset $A \subset X$ is said to be of (i, j)-first category (also called (i, j)-meager, (i, j)-exhaustible) relative to Y if $A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, where $A_n \in (i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y, X)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$, and A is said to be of (i, j)-second category (also called (i, j)-nonmeager, (i, j)-inexhaustible) relative to Y if it is not of (i, j)-first category relative to Y.

A subset $A \subset X$ is said to be of (i, j)-first category in itself relative to Y if $A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, where $A_n \in (i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y \cap A, A)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$ and hence, A is of (i, j)-second category in itself relative to Y if it is not of (i, j)-first category in itself relative to Y.

The families of all subsets of X which are of (i, j)-first ((i, j)-second) categories relative to Y, are denoted by $(i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}at g_{\mathrm{I}}(Y, X)$ ($(i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}at g_{\mathrm{II}}(Y, X)$), while

$$A \in (i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}at g_{\mathrm{I}}(Y \cap A, A) \quad \big(A \in (i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}at g_{\mathrm{II}}(Y \cap A, A)\big)$$

is abbreviated to A is of $(i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}at g_{Y}\,\mathrm{I}$ ($(i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}at g_{Y}\,\mathrm{II}$).

Clearly

$$(i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y, X) \subset (i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}at g_{\mathrm{I}}(Y, X) = 2^X \setminus (i, j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}at g_{\mathrm{II}}(Y, X).$$

Now, if (Y,τ') is a TsS of a TS (X,τ) and $A\subset X$, then $A\in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X) \Longleftrightarrow A=\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, where $A_n\in \mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$ and $\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X) = 2^X\backslash \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. Therefore, $A\in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y\cap A,A)$ $(A\in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y\cap A,A))$ is abbreviated to A is of $\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ I ($\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ II).

Theorem 12.16. *For a* BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *The families* (i,j)-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$ *are σ-ideals so that if* $A_n\in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$ *for each* $n=\overline{1,\infty}$, *then*

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X),$$

and if $B\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$, $A\subset B$, *then* $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$.

(2) *If* $A=\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in j$-$\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$ *and* $A_n\in i$-$s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ *for each* $n=\overline{1,\infty}$, *then* $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$.

(3) *For every set* $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$ *there is a set* $B\in j$-$\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)\cap (i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$ *such that* $A\subset B$.

(4) *The families* (i,j)-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$ *are closed under arbitrary unions and* $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$, $A\subset B$ *imply that* $B\in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$.

(5) *If* X *is of* (i,j)-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ II *and for any subset* $A\subset X$ *there is a set* $B\subset A$ *such that* $B=\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\in j$-$\mathcal{G}_\delta(X)$ *and* $B_n\in i$-$s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ *for each* $n=\overline{1,\infty}$, *then* $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$.

(6) X *is of* (i,j)-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ II *if and only if the intersection of any sequence* $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, *where* $A_n\in\tau_j\cap i$-$s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ *for each* $n=\overline{1,\infty}$, *is nonempty.*

Moreover, for a BsS $(Y,\tau_1'<\tau_2')$ *of a* BS $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$ *we have*

(7)
$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X) & \subset & 1\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)\\
\bigcap & & \bigcap\\
2\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X) & \subset & (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)
\end{array}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X) & \subset & 1\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)\\
\bigcap & & \bigcap\\
2\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X) & \subset & (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)
\end{array}$$

Proof. The conditions (1) and (4) are obvious, (7) follows directly from (1) of Corollary 12.4.

(2) Let $A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$, i.e., $A_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. By condition $\tau'_i \operatorname{int}(A_n \cap Y) = \varnothing$ so that $\tau'_i \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A_n \cap Y) = \varnothing$ and thus, $A_n \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Hence $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}at g_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$.

(3) Let $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. Then $A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, where $A_n \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. But $A_n \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ implies that $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A_n \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Let $B = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_j \operatorname{cl} A_n$. Then $A \subset B$ and $B \in j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X) \cap (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$.

(5) Let $A \subset X$ be any subset and $B \subset A$, where $B = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \in j\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X)$, i.e., $B_n \in \tau_j$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. By condition $B_n \cap Y \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(Y)$ so that $F_n = Y \setminus B_n \in i\text{-}\mathcal{B}d(Y)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Since $X \setminus B = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus B_n) \in j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$ and $(X \setminus B_n) \cap Y = Y \setminus B_n$, we have

$$\varnothing = \tau'_i \operatorname{int}(Y \setminus B_n) = \tau'_i \operatorname{int}((X \setminus B_n) \cap Y) = \tau'_i \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl}(X \setminus B_n) \cap Y)$$

and so $(X \setminus B_n) \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Hence $X \setminus B \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. But $B \subset A$ implies $X \setminus A \subset X \setminus B$ and by (1), $X \setminus A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. Then $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$ since, by virtue of (1), the contrary means that X is of $\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ I.

(6) First, let $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of subsets of X such that $A_n \in \tau_j \cap i\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$ and $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = \varnothing$. Then

$$X = X \setminus \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus A_n),$$

where $X \setminus A_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j \cap i\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Hence, by (2), X is of $(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ I.

Conversely, if X is of $(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ I, then by (3), $X \in j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$, i.e., $X = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$, where $F_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j \cap i\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Let us consider the sequence $\{X \setminus F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, where $X \setminus F_n \in \tau_j \cap i\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. It is clear that $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus F_n) = \varnothing$. □

Corollary 12.17. *For a* TS (Y,τ') *of a* TS (X,τ) *the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *The family* $\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$ *is a* σ*-ideal.*

(2) *If* $A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(X)$ *and* $A_n \in s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ *for each* $n = \overline{1,\infty}$, *then* $A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$.

(3) *For every set* $A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$ *there is a set* $B \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(X) \cap \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$ *such that* $A \subset B$.

(4) *The family* $\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$ *is closed under arbitrary unions and* $A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$, $A \subset B$ *imply that* $B \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$.

(5) *If* X *is of* $\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}\,\mathrm{II}$ *and for any subset* $A \subset X$ *there is a set* $B \subset A$ *such that* $B = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \in \mathcal{G}_\delta(X)$ *and* $B_n \in s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ *for each* $n = \overline{1,\infty}$, *then* $A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$.

(6) X *is of* $\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}\,\mathrm{II}$ *if and only if the intersection of any sequence* $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, *where* $A_n \in \tau \cap s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ *for each* $n = \overline{1,\infty}$, *is nonempty.*

Corollary 12.18. *If* (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *is a* BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2), X *is of* (i,j)-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}\,\mathrm{II}$, $A = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in j\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X)$ *and* $A_n \in i\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ *for each* $n = \overline{1,\infty}$, *then* $A \in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$.

Proof. Follows directly from (5) of Theorem 12.16 for $B = A$. ☐

Corollary 12.19. *If* (Y,τ') *is a* TsS *of a* TS (X,τ), X *is of* $\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}\,\mathrm{II}$, $A = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{G}_\delta(X)$ *and* $A_n \in s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ *for each* $n = \overline{1,\infty}$, *then* $A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$.

Corollary 12.20. *If* $(Y,\tau_1 < \tau_2')$ *is a* BsS *of a* BS $(X,\tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *and* X *is of* $(1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}\,\mathrm{II}$, *then for* $A = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ *we have:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
A_n \in \tau_1 \cap 2\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X) \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & A_n \in \tau_2 \cap 2\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X) \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & \\
A_n \in \tau_1 \cap 1\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X) \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & A_n \in \tau_2 \cap 1\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X) \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. Follows directly from Corollary 12.18 and the inclusion $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$. ☐

Definition 12.21. A BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) is (i,j)-quasi regular in X if for any set $U' \in \tau_i' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ there is a set $V \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that $\tau_j'\,\mathrm{cl}(V \cap Y) \subset U'$.

Theorem 12.22. *If a* BsS $(Y, \tau_1 < \tau_2')$ *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *is* $(2,1)$*-quasi regular in* X *and* 1*-compact, then* $(2,1)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X) \subset$ 2-$s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$.

Proof. Let $A \in (2,1)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X)$ be any set. Then $A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, where $A_n \in (2,1)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)(\Longleftrightarrow \tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_n \cap Y) = \varnothing)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. We shall prove that $\tau_2' \operatorname{int}(A \cap Y) = \varnothing$. Clearly, it suffices to prove that for any set $V \in \tau_2' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ we have $V \cap (Y \setminus A) \neq \varnothing$. Suppose that $V \in \tau_2' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ is an arbitrary set. Then $V \setminus (\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_1 \cap Y) \neq \varnothing$ since the contrary means that $V \subset \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_1 \cap Y$ which is impossible since $\tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_1 \cap Y) = \varnothing$. By condition, there is $U_1 \in \tau_2 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that

$$\tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(U_1 \cap Y) \subset V \setminus (\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_1 \cap Y)$$

so that $\tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(U_1 \cap Y) \subset V$ and $\tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(U_1 \cap Y) \cap A_1 = \varnothing$. By analogy, there is $U_2 \in \tau_2 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that

$$\tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(U_2 \cap Y) \subset U_1 \cap Y \subset \tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(U_1 \cap Y)$$

and $\tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(U_2 \cap Y) \cap A_2 = \varnothing$. Therefore, one can construct a sequence $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \tau_2 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that $\tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(U_n \cap Y) \subset U_{n-1}$ and $\tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(U_n \cap Y) \cap A_n = \varnothing$. Now, Y is 1-compact implies that $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(U_n \cap Y) \neq \varnothing$, i.e., there is a point $x \in \tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(U_n \cap Y)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Therefore, $x \in V \setminus \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = V \setminus A$ so that $V \cap (X \setminus A) \neq \varnothing$ and since $V \subset Y$, $V \cap (Y \setminus A) \neq \varnothing$. □

Corollary 12.23. *If a* TsS (Y, τ') *of a* TS (X, τ) *is quasi regular in* X *and compact, then* $\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X) \subset s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$.

Theorem 12.24. *For a* BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) $U \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\} \Longrightarrow U \in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(Y,X)$.

(2) *If* $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *is a countable family of subsets of* X *such that* $U_n \in \tau_j \cap i$-$s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ *for each* $n = \overline{1,\infty}$, *then* $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n \in i$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$.

(3) $A \in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow X \setminus A \in i$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$.

(4) *If* $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *is a countable family of subsets of* X *such that* $F_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j \cap i$-$s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ *for each* $n = \overline{1,\infty}$, *then* $\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n \in i$-$\mathcal{B}d(X)$.

Proof. (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2). Let $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset 2^X$, where $U_n \in \tau_j \cap i$-$s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Then $X \setminus U_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j \cap i$-$s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$

and so

$$V = X \setminus \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus U_n) \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$$

as $X \setminus U_n \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. If $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n \,\overline{\in}\, i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, then there is $U \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that $U \cap \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n = \varnothing$.

Hence $U \subset X \setminus \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n = V$ and since $V \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$, by (1) of Theorem 12.16, $U \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3). Let $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. Then, by (3) of Theorem 12.16, there is a set $B \in j\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X) \cap (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$ such that $A \subset B$. Therefore $B = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$, where $B_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j \cap i\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$, and $X \setminus B = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus B_n)$. Clearly $X \setminus B_n \in \tau_j \cap i\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$ and by (2), $X \setminus B \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$. Now, it is evident that $X \setminus A \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$.

(3) $\Longrightarrow$ (4). If $F = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$, where $F_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j \cap i\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$, then $F_n \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$ and so $F \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. Hence, by (3), $X \setminus F \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ and thus $F \in i\text{-}\mathcal{B}d(X)$.

(4) $\Longrightarrow$ (1). Let $U \in (\tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}) \cap (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. Then $U = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n$, where $U_n \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Therefore, $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U_n \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$ and so $\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U_n \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. But $\{\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a countable family, where $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_j \cap i\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Therefore, by (4), $\tau_i \operatorname{int} \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U_n = \varnothing$ and hence,

$$U = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n \subset \tau_i \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_j \operatorname{cl} U_n$$

implies that $U = \varnothing$. A contradiction. □

Corollary 12.25. *For a* TsS (Y,τ') *of a* TS (X,τ) *the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) $U \in \tau \setminus \{\varnothing\} \Longrightarrow U \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$.

(2) *If* $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *is a countable family of subsets of* X *such that* $U_n \in \tau \cap s\text{-}\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ *for each* $n=\overline{1,\infty}$, *then* $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n \in \mathcal{D}(X)$.

(3) $A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X) \Longrightarrow X \setminus A \in \mathcal{D}(X)$.

(4) *If* $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *is a countable family of subsets of* X *such that* $F_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau \cap s\text{-}\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ *for each* $n=\overline{1,\infty}$, *then* $\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n \in \mathcal{B}d(X)$.

Definition 12.26. A BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') (TsS (Y,τ')) of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) (TS (X,τ)) is a almost (i,j)-Baire space (almost Baire space) in X (briefly, Y is an A-(i,j)-BrS in X (Y is an A-BrS in X)) if anyone of the equivalent conditions (1)–(4) of Theorem 12.24 (Corollary 12.25) is satisfied.

Definition 12.27. A BsS (Y,τ_1',τ_2') (TsS (Y,τ')) of a BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) (TS (X,τ)) is an (i,j)-Baire space (Baire space) in X (briefly, Y is an (i,j)-BrS in X (Y is a BrS in X)) if $U \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ ($U \in \tau \setminus \{\varnothing\}$) implies that U is of (i,j)-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ II ($\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ II).

Lemma 12.28. *If* (Y,τ_1',τ_2') *is a* BsS *of a* BS (X,τ_1,τ_2) *and* $U \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, *then*

(1) U *is of* (i,j)-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ II *implies that* $U \in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$.

If, in addition, $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$, $Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ *and* $U \in \tau_1 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, *then*

(2) U *is of* $(1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ II $\Longleftrightarrow U \in (1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$.

Proof. (1) Let U be of (i,j)-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ II and $U \in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. Then $U=\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n$, where $\tau_i' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} U_n \cap Y)=\varnothing$, i.e., $U_n \in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$. Since $(Y\cap U,\tau_1''',\tau_2''') \subset (U,\tau_1'',\tau_2'') \subset (X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$, we have $\tau_i''' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j'' \operatorname{cl} U_n \cap (U\cap Y))=\varnothing$, i.e., $U_n \in (i,j)$-$\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y\cap U,U)$ for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$ so that U is of (i,j)-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ I.

(2) By (1), it suffices to prove the implication from the right to the left, i.e., U is of $(1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ I implies that $U \in (1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$, where U is of $(1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ I $\Longleftrightarrow U \in (1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y\cap U,U)$.

Since $U \in (1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y\cap U,U)$, we have $U=\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, where $A_n \in (1,2)$-$\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y\cap U,U)$ for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$.

Let $V' \in \tau_1'\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ be any set. If $V'\cap U=\varnothing$, i.e., $V'\cap(Y\cap U)=\varnothing$, then $V'\cap \tau_2' \operatorname{cl}(Y\cap U)=\varnothing$ as $V' \in \tau_1' \subset \tau_2'$, so that $V'\cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(Y\cap U)=\varnothing$. Let $V=W\setminus \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U$, where $W \in \tau_1 \subset \tau_2$ and $W\cap Y=V'$. Since

$Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, we have $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(U \cap Y)$ and so

$$V \cap Y = (W \setminus \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U) \cap Y = V' \setminus \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U = V' \setminus \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(U \cap Y) = V'.$$

Since $V \cap \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} U = \varnothing$, we have $V \cap A_n = \varnothing$ and by (3) of Proposition 12.3, $A_n \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Thus $U \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$.

Now, let $V \in \tau_1' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ and $V' \cap U = V' \cap (Y \cap U) \neq \varnothing$. Then $V' \cap U \in \tau_1''' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ and since $A_n \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y \cap U, U)$, there is $U' \in \tau_2'' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that $U' \cap (Y \cap U) = U' \cap Y \subset V'$ and $U' \cap A_n = \varnothing$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. But $U' \in \tau_2''$ and $U \in \tau_2$ imply that $U' \in \tau_2 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$. Therefore, for $V' \in \tau_1' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ there is $U' \in \tau_2 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that $U' \cap Y \subset V'$ and $U' \cap A_n = \varnothing$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Once more applying (3) of Proposition 12.3 gives that $A_n \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$ and thus $U \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. □

Corollary 12.29. *Let* (Y, τ_1', τ_2') *be a* BsS *of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2). *Then*

(1) *If* Y *is an* (i,j)-BrS *in* X, *then* Y *is an* A-(i,j)-BrS *in* X.

Moreover, if $\tau_1 \subset \tau_2$ *and* $Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, *then*

(2) Y *is a* $(1,2)$-BrS *in* X *if and only if* Y *is an* A-$(1,2)$-BrS *in* X.

Corollary 12.30. *If* (Y, τ') *be a* TsS *of a* TS (X, τ) *and* $Y \in \mathcal{D}(X)$, *then*

1. *If* $U \in \tau \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, *then* U *is of* $\mathcal{C}atg_Y$ II *if and only if* $U \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$.
2. Y *is a* BrS *in* X *if and only if* Y *is an* A-BrS *in* X.

Proposition 12.31. *For a* BsS $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *If* $Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ *and* Y *is a* $(1,2)$-BrS *in* X, *then* Y *is a* 1-BrS *in* X.
2. *If* Y *is a* 2-BrS *in* X, *then* Y *is a* $(2,1)$-BrS *in* X.

Proof. (1) Let $U \in \tau_1 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ be any set. Then U is of $(1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_Y$ II and by (2) of Lemma 12.28, $U \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$. Hence, following (7) of Theorem 12.16, $U \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$. Hence, by the topological version of (2) of Lemma 12.28, $U \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_Y$ II.

(2) If $U \in \tau_2 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ is any set, then by the topological part of Definition 12.27, U is of $2\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_Y$ II, i.e., $U \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y \cap U, U)$. But, by (7) of Theorem 12.16, $2\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y \cap U, U) \subset (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y \cap U, U)$ and so U is of $(2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_Y$ II. Thus, according to Definition 12.27, Y is a $(2,1)$-BrS in X. □

Proposition 12.32. *If $(Z,\tau_1''<\tau_2'')\subset(Y,\tau_1'<\tau_2')\subset(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$, then the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *$Y\in\tau_1$ and Z is a $(1,2)$-BrS in X imply that Z is also a $(1,2)$-BrS in Y.*
2. *$Y\in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ and Z is a $(1,2)$-BrS in Y imply that Z is also a $(1,2)$-BrS in X.*

Proof. (1) If $U\in\tau_1'\setminus\{\varnothing\}$, then $U\in\tau_1\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ and so U is of $(1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Z}$ II.

(2) Contrary: there is $U\in\tau_1\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ such that U is of $(1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Z}$ I. Hence, by (2) of Lemma 12.28, $U\in(1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Z,X)$ and so $U=\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty}A_n$, where $A_n\in(1,2)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Z,X)$, i.e., $\tau_1''\operatorname{int}(\tau_2\operatorname{cl}A_n\cap Z)=\varnothing$ for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$. Therefore, $\tau_1''\operatorname{int}(\tau_2'\operatorname{cl}(A_n\cap Y)\cap Z)=\varnothing$ for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$ so that $U\cap Y\in(\tau_1'\setminus\{\varnothing\})\cap(1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Z,Y)$. But this is impossible, since by (2) of Corollary 12.29, Z is a $(1,2)$-BrS in Y if and only if Z is an A-$(1,2)$-BrS in Y. □

Corollary 12.33. *If $(Z,\tau)\subset(Y,\tau)\subset(X,\tau)$, then the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *$Y\in\tau$ and Z is a BrS in X imply that Z is also a BrS in Y.*
2. *$Y\in\mathcal{D}(X)$ and Z is a BrS in Y imply that Z is also a BrS in X.*

It is of interest and very important for further investigations to study various types of relative properties of relative notions as for the topological case so for the bitopological case.

Proposition 12.34. *If $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'')\subset(Y,\tau_1',\tau_2')\subset(X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$, $Z\in\tau_i'$ and $A\subset X$, then the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *$A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ ($A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$) implies that $A\cap Y\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Z,Y)$ ($A\cap Y\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Z,Y)$) and so $A\cap Y\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{SD}(Z,Y)$ ($A\cap Y\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Z,Y)$) implies that $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{SD}(Y,X)$ ($A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$).*
2. *$A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ ($A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$) implies that $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{ND}(Z,X)$ ($A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Z,X)$) and so $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{SD}(Z,X)$ ($A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Z,X)$) implies that $A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{SD}(Y,X)$ ($A\in(i,j)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$).*

Proof. It is evident that in both cases it suffices to prove only the first implication.

(1) Using (1) of Proposition 12.3, let us prove that if

$$\tau_j\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y\subset\tau_i'\operatorname{cl}\big(Y\setminus(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y)\big),$$

then

$$\tau'_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap Z \subset \tau''_i \operatorname{cl}\big(Z \setminus (\tau'_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap Z)\big).$$

Since $Z \in \tau'_i$, we have

$$\tau'_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap Z \subset \tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y \cap Z \subset \tau'_i \operatorname{cl}\big(Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)\big) \cap Z \subset \\ \subset \tau'_i \operatorname{cl}\big(\big(Y \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)\big) \cap Z\big) = \tau'_i \operatorname{cl}\big(Z \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)\big).$$

Thus

$$\tau'_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap Z \subset \tau'_i \operatorname{cl}\big(Z \setminus \tau'_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)\big) \cap Z = \\ = \tau''_i \operatorname{cl}\big(Z \setminus (\tau'_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap Z)\big).$$

(2) By analogy with (1), we use (1) of Proposition 12.3. Since $Z \in \tau'_i$ and $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ we have

$$(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \cap Z = \tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Z \subset \tau'_i \operatorname{cl}\big(Y \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)\big) \cap Z \subset \\ \subset \tau'_i \operatorname{cl}\big(Z \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Z)\big),$$

so that

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Z \subset \tau'_i \operatorname{cl}\big(Z \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Z)\big) \cap Z = \tau''_i \operatorname{cl}\big(Z \setminus (\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Z)\big).$$

□

Corollary 12.35. *If $(Z, \tau''_1 < \tau''_2) \subset (Y, \tau'_1 < \tau'_2) \subset (X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$, then the conditions (1) and (2) of Proposition 12.34 are satisfied for $Z \in \tau'_1$.*

Corollary 12.36. *If $(Z, \tau''_1, \tau''_2) \subset (Y, \tau'_1, \tau'_2) \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, $Z \in \tau'_i$ and $Y \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, then Z is an A-(i,j)-*BrS *in Y implies that Y is an A-(i,j)-*BrS *in X.*

Proof. Let $U \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ be any set. Since $Y \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, we have $U' = U \cap Y \in \tau'_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ and so $U' \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(Z,Y)$ as Z is an A-(i,j)-BrS in Y. Since $Z \in \tau'_i$, by (1) of Proposition 12.34, $U \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(Y,X)$ and it remains ro recall Definition 12.26. □

Corollary 12.37. *If $(Z, \tau''_1 < \tau''_2) \subset (Y, \tau'_1 < \tau'_2) \subset (X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ and $Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, then*

(1) *$Z \in \tau'_1$ and Z is a $(1,2)$-*BrS *in Y imply that Y is a $(1,2)$-*BrS *in X.*
(2) *$Z \in \tau'_2$ and Z is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS *in Y imply that Y is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS *in X.*

Proof. (1) If Z is a $(1,2)$-BrS in Y, then by (1) of Corollary 12.29, Z is an A-$(1,2)$-BrS in Y. Hence, by Corollary 12.36, Y is an A-$(1,2)$-BrS in X and so, it remains to use (2) of Corollary 12.29.

(2) Follows directly from Corollary 12.36. □

Corollary 12.38. *If* $(Z,\tau'') \subset (Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$*,* $Z \in \tau'$ *and* $A \subset X$*, then the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. $A \in \mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Y,X))$ *implies that* $A \cap Y \in \mathcal{ND}(Z,Y)$ $(A \cap Y \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Z,Y))$ *and so* $A \cap Y \in \mathcal{SD}(Z,Y)$ $(A \cap Y \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,Y))$ *implies that* $A \in \mathcal{SD}(Y,X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Y,X))$*.*
2. $A \in \mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Y,X))$ *implies that* $A \in \mathcal{ND}(Z,X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Z,X))$ *and so* $A \in \mathcal{SD}(Z,X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,X))$ *implies that* $A \in \mathcal{SD}(Y,X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Y,X))$*.*

Corollary 12.39. *If* $(Z,\tau'') \subset (Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$*,* $Z \in \tau'$ *and* $Y \in \mathcal{D}(X)$*, then* Z *is a* BrS *in* Y *implies that* Y *is a* BrS *in* X*.*

Proposition 12.40. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'' < \tau_2'') \subset (Y,\tau_1' < \tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1 < \tau_2)$*,* $Z \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(Y)$ *and* $A \subset X$*, then* $A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Z,X) \Longleftrightarrow A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ $(A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Z,X) \Longleftrightarrow A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Y,X))$ *and so*

$$A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Z,X) \Longleftrightarrow A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Y,X)$$
$$\big(A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,X) \Longleftrightarrow A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Y,X)\big).$$

Proof. Evidently, it suffices to prove only the first equivalence.

Let $A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Z,X)$ and $A \mathrel{\overline{\in}} (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$. Then $\tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \neq \varnothing$ and $Z \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(Y)$ imply that

$$\varnothing \neq \tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \cap Z \subset \tau_2'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)$$

which is impossible.

Conversely, let $A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ and $A \mathrel{\overline{\in}} (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Z,X)$. Then $\tau_2'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \neq \varnothing$ and so there is $U \in \tau_2' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that $\varnothing \neq U \cap Z = \tau_2'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)$. Since $Z \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(Y)$, we have

$$\tau_2' \operatorname{cl} U = \tau_2' \operatorname{cl}(U \cap Z) = \tau_2' \operatorname{cl} \tau_2'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y).$$

Hence

$$\tau_1' \operatorname{cl} \tau_2' \operatorname{cl} U = \tau_1' \operatorname{cl} \tau_2' \operatorname{cl} \tau_2'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)$$

and by (2) of Lemma 0.2.1 in [8], $\tau_1' \operatorname{cl} U = \tau_1' \operatorname{cl} \tau_2'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y)$. Therefore, $U \in \tau_2' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ gives that

$$\varnothing \neq \tau_2' \operatorname{int} \tau_1' \operatorname{cl} U = \tau_2' \operatorname{int} \tau_1' \operatorname{cl} \tau_2'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) \subset$$
$$\subset \tau_2' \operatorname{int} \tau_1' \operatorname{cl}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) = \tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y),$$

i.e., $A \mathrel{\overline{\in}} (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ which is a contradiction. □

Corollary 12.41. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'' < \tau_2'') \subset (Y,\tau_1' < \tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *and* $Z \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(Y)$*, then* Z *is an* A-$(2,1)$-BrS *in* X *if and only if* Y *is an* A-$(2,1)$-BrS *in* X*.*

Proof. Indeed, if $U \in \tau_2 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ is any set, then by Proposition 12.40, $U \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(Z,X)$ if and only if $U \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(Y,X)$. $\square$

Corollary 12.42. *If $(Z,\tau'') \subset (Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$, $Z \in \mathcal{D}(Y)$ and $A \subset X$, then $A \in \mathcal{ND}(Z,X) \iff A \in \mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Z,X) \iff A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X))$ and so $A \in \mathcal{SD}(Z,X) \iff A \in \mathcal{SD}(Y,X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(Z,X) \iff A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(Y,X))$.*

Corollary 12.43. *If $(Z,\tau'') \subset (Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$ and $Z \in \mathcal{D}(Y)$, then Z is a* BrS *in X if and only if Y is a* BrS *in X.*

Proposition 12.44. *If $(Y,\tau_1',\tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ and $Y \in \tau_i$, then $(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(X) \subset (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ $((i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(X) \subset (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X))$ and so*

$$(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Y,X) \subset (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(X)$$
$$\big((i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(Y,X) \subset (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(X)\big).$$

Proof. If $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(X)$, i.e., if $\tau_i \operatorname{int} \tau_j \operatorname{cl} A = \varnothing$, then $\tau_i \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) = \varnothing$ so that $\tau_i' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y) = \varnothing$ as $Y \in \tau_i$. $\square$

Corollary 12.45. *If $(Y,\tau_1',\tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ and $Y \in \tau_i$, then Y is an A-(i,j)-*BrS *in X implies that X is an A-(i,j)-*BrS*.*

Proof. If $U \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ is an arbitrary set, then $U \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(Y,X)$ and so $U \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(X)$. Hence, it remains to use Definition 4.1.5 in [8]. $\square$

Corollary 12.46. *If $(Y,\tau_1' < \tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1 < \tau_2)$ and $Y \in \tau_1$, then the conditions of Proposition* 12.44 *are satisfied.*

Corollary 12.47. *If $(Y,\tau_1' < \tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1 < \tau_2)$ and $Y \in \tau_1$, then*

(1) *$Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ and Y is a $(1,2)$-*BrS *in X imply that X is a $(1,2)$-*BrS*.*
(2) *Y is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS *in X implies that X is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS*.*

Proof. (1) It remains to use (2) of Lemma 12.28 and (4) of Theorem 4.1.6 in [8].

(2) Follows directly from Corollary 12.45. $\square$

Corollary 12.48. *If $(Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$ and $Y \in \tau$, then $\mathcal{ND}(X) \subset \mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ $(\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(X) \subset \mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X))$ and so $\mathcal{SD}(Y,X) \subset \mathcal{SD}(X)$ $(\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(Y,X) \subset \mathcal{C}atg_{\text{II}}(X))$.*

Corollary 12.49. *If $(Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$ and $Y \in \tau \cap \mathcal{D}(X)$, then Y is a* BrS *in X implies that X is a* BrS*.*

Proof. The condition is an immediate consequence of (2) of Corollary 12.30, Corollary 12.48 and the well-known topological fact, following which

U is of second category in itself if and only if $U \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(X)$. $\square$

Proposition 12.50. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'') \subset (Y,\tau_1',\tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ *and* $A \subset Y$ *is any set, then* $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Z,Y) \iff A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Z,X)$ $(A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Z,Y) \iff A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Z,X))$ *and so*

$$A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Z,Y) \iff A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Z,X)$$
$$\big(A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,Y) \iff A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,X)\big).$$

Proof. Since $Z \subset Y$ and $A \subset Y$ we have

$$\tau_i'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j' \operatorname{cl} A \cap Z) = \tau_i'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y \cap Z) = \tau_i'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Z).$$

Hence $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Z,Y) \iff A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Z,X)$. The rest is obvious. $\square$

Corollary 12.51. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'' < \tau_2'') \subset (Y,\tau_1' < \tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *and* $Y \in \tau_1$*, then* Z *is a* $(1,2)$-BrS *in* X *implies that* Z *is a* $(1,2)$-BrS *in* Y.

Proof. Let $U \in \tau_1' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ be any set. Then $U \in \tau_1 \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ and by condition, U is of $(1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_Z$ II. $\square$

Corollary 12.52. *If* $(Z,\tau'') \subset (Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$ *and* $A \subset Y$ *is any set, then* $A \in \mathcal{ND}(Z,Y) \iff A \in \mathcal{ND}(Z,X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Z,Y) \iff A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Z,X))$ *and so* $A \in \mathcal{SD}(Z,Y) \iff A \in \mathcal{SD}(Z,X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,Y) \iff A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,X))$.

Corollary 12.53. *If* $(Z,\tau'') \subset (Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$ *and* $Y \in \tau$*, then* Z *is a* BrS *in* X *implies that* Z *is a* BrS *in* Y.

Proposition 12.54. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'') \subset (Y,\tau_1',\tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$ *and* $A \subset X$ *is any set, then* $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Z,X)$ $(A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Z,X))$ *implies that* $A \cap Y \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Z,Y)$ $(A \cap Y \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm I}(Z,Y))$ *and so* $A \cap Y \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Z,Y)$ $(A \cap Y \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,Y))$ *implies that* $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Z,X)$ $(A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,X))$.

Proof. It is evident that $\tau_i'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Z) = \varnothing$ implies that $\tau_i'' \operatorname{int}(\tau_j' \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap Z) = \varnothing$. The rest is obvious. $\square$

Corollary 12.55. *If* $(Z,\tau_1'',\tau_2'') \subset (Y,\tau_1',\tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1,\tau_2)$, $Y \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ *and* Z *is an* A-(i,j)-BrS *in* Y*, then* Z *is an* A-(i,j)-BrS *in* X.

Proof. Let $U \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ be any set. Then $U' = U \cap Y \in \tau_i' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ and so $U' \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,Y)$. Hence $U \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\rm II}(Z,X)$. $\square$

Corollary 12.56. *Let $(Z, \tau_1'' < \tau_2'') \subset (Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ and $Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$. Then*

(1) *Z is a $(1,2)$-*BrS* in Y implies that Z is a $(1,2)$-*BrS* in X.*
(2) *Z is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS* in Y implies that Z is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS* in X.*

Corollary 12.57. *If $(Z, \tau'') \subset (Y, \tau') \subset (X, \tau)$ and $A \subset X$ is any set, then $A \in \mathcal{ND}(Z, X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Z, X))$ implies that $A \cap Y \in \mathcal{ND}(Z, Y)$ $(A \cap Y \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Z, Y))$ and so $A \cap Y \in \mathcal{SD}(Z, Y)$ $(A \cap Y \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Z, Y)$ implies that $A \in \mathcal{SD}(Z, X)$ $(A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Z, X))$.*

Corollary 12.58. *If $(Z, \tau'') \subset (Y, \tau') \subset (X, \tau)$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}(X)$, then Z is a *BrS* in Y implies that Z is a *BrS* in X.*

Theorem 12.59. *Let $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ be a *BsS* of a *BS* $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$. Then the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *If Y is a $(1,2)$-*BrS* in X and $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of subsets of X, where $A_n \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap 1\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y, X)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$, then $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap 1\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$.*
(2) *If Y is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS* in X and $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of subsets of X, where $A_n \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap 2\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y, X)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$, then $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$.*

Proof. (1) Clearly, $X \setminus A_n = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus A_n^k)$, where $X \setminus A_n^k \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2$ for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$, $n = \overline{1, \infty}$ and $X \setminus A_n \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X) \cap 1\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y, X)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Then $X \setminus A_n^k \in 1\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y, X)$ for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$, $n = \overline{1, \infty}$ and by (2) of Theorem 12.16, $X \setminus A_n \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y, X)$. Hence, by (1) of Theorem 12.16, $\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus A_n) \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y, X)$. But by (1) of Corollary 12.29, Y is an A-$(1,2)$-BrS in X and hence, by (3) of Theorem 12.24 with Definition 12.26 taken into account,

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} \Big(X \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus A_n) \Big) = \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = X.$$

Thus $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap 1\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$.

(2) Evidently, $X \setminus A_n = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus A_n^k)$, where $X \setminus A_n^k \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1$ for each $k = \overline{1, \infty}$, $n = \overline{1, \infty}$ and $X \setminus A_n \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X) \cap 2\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y, X)$ for each

$n=\overline{1,\infty}$. Then $X\setminus A_n^k \in 2\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(Y,X)$ for each $k=\overline{1,\infty}$, $n=\overline{1,\infty}$ and by (2) of Theorem 12.16, $X\setminus A_n \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X)$ for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$. Hence, by (1) of Theorem 12.16, $\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty}(X\setminus A_n) \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X)$. Thus, by (3) of Theorem 12.24 in conjunction with Definition 12.26,

$$\tau_2 \operatorname{cl}\Big(X\setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty}(X\setminus A_n)\Big) = \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = X,$$

i.e., $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X)\cap 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$. □

Corollary 12.60. *If (Y,τ') is a* TsS *of a* TS (X,τ)*, Y is a* BrS *in X and $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of subsets of X, where $A_n \in \mathcal{G}_\delta(X)\cap s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$, then $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{G}_\delta(X)\cap \mathcal{D}(X)$.*

Note here that the theorem below characterizes all subsets of X, belonging to the family$(1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X)$ $((2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X))$ for a $(1,2)$-BrS (an A-$(2,1)$-BrS) Y in X.

Theorem 12.61. *Let $(Y,\tau_1'<\tau_2')$ be a* BsS *of a* BS $(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$*. Then for any subset $A\subset X$ the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *If $Y\in\tau_1$ and Y is a* $(1,2)$-BrS *in X, then $A\in(1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X)$ if and only if $X\setminus A$ contains a set $B\in 2\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X)\cap 1\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$.*
2. *If $Y\in\tau_2$ and Y is an* A-$(2,1)$-BrS *in X, then $A\in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X)$ if and only if $X\setminus A$ contains a set $B\in 1\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X)\cap 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$.*

Proof. (1) First, let $A\in(1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y,X)$, i.e., $A=\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, where $A_n\in(1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$. Then $\{X\setminus \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a countable family of 2-open subsets of X and

$$\begin{gathered}\tau_1' \operatorname{cl}\big((X\setminus\tau_2\operatorname{cl}A_n)\cap Y\big) = \tau_1'\operatorname{cl}(Y\setminus\tau_2\operatorname{cl}A_n) = \\ = \tau_1'\operatorname{cl}\big(Y\setminus(\tau_2\operatorname{cl}A_n\cap Y)\big) = Y\setminus\tau_1'\operatorname{int}(\tau_2\operatorname{cl}A_n\cap Y) = Y\end{gathered}$$

so that $X\setminus\tau_2\operatorname{cl}A_n\in\tau_2\cap 1\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ for each $n=\overline{1,\infty}$. Since Y is a $(1,2)$-BrS in X, by (1) of Corollary 12.29 in conjunction with (2) of Theorem 12.24

$$B=\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty}(X\setminus\tau_2\operatorname{cl}A_n)\in 2\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X)\cap 1\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$$

and $B\subset X\setminus A$.

Conversely, let $B = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap 1\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ and $B \subset X \setminus A$. Since $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} B = X$, we have $\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_n = X$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Hence,

$$\tau_1 \operatorname{int}(X \setminus A_n) = \tau_1 \operatorname{int} \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(X \setminus A_n) = X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} \tau_2 \operatorname{int} A_n = \varnothing$$

so that $X \setminus A_n \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(X)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Since $Y \in \tau_1$, taking into account Proposition 12.44,

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus A_n) \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(X) \subset (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y, X).$$

Moreover, $B = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \subset X \setminus A$ implies that $A \subset X \setminus B$ and thus, by (1) of Theorem 12.16, $A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y, X)$.

(2) Let $A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y, X)$, i.e., $A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, where $A_n \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y, X)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Then $\{X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a countable family of 1-open subsets of X and

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_2' \operatorname{cl}\big((X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_n) \cap Y\big) &= \tau_2' \operatorname{cl}\big(Y \setminus (\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_n \cap Y)\big) = \\ &= Y \setminus \tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_n \cap Y) = Y \end{aligned}$$

so that $X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_n \in \tau_1 \cap 2\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y, X)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Since Y is an A-$(2,1)$-BrS in X, by (2) of Theorem 12.24, $B = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus \tau_1 \operatorname{cl} A_n) \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ and $B \subset X \setminus A$.

Conversely, let $B = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ and $B \subset X \setminus A$. Since $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} B = X$, we have $\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} A_n = X$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Hence,

$$\tau_2 \operatorname{int}(X \setminus A_n) = \tau_2 \operatorname{int} \tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(X \setminus A_n) = X \setminus \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} \tau_1 \operatorname{int} A_n = \varnothing$$

so that $X \setminus A_n \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(X)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Therefore, since $Y \in \tau_2$, by Proposition 12.44,

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus A_n) \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(X) \subset (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y, X)$$

and since $A \subset X \setminus B$, by (1) of Theorem 12.16, $A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y, X)$. □

Corollary 12.62. *If* (Y, τ') *is a* BrS *in* (X, τ), $Y \in \tau$ *and* $A \subset X$ *is any set, then* $A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y, X)$ *if and only if* $X \setminus A$ *contains a set* $B \in \mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap \mathcal{D}(X)$

Thus, Corollary 12.62 characterizes all subsets of X, belonging to the family $\mathcal{C}atg_{\text{I}}(Y, X)$ for a BrS Y in X.

Theorem 12.63. *Let* $\{(Y_\alpha, \tau_1^\alpha, \tau_2^\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in D}$ *be a family of bitopological subspaces of a* BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) *and* $Y = \bigcup\limits_{a\in D} Y_\alpha \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$*. If there is* $\alpha_0 \in D$ *such that* $Y_{\alpha_0} \in \tau_i$ *and* Y_{α_0} *is an* A-(i,j)-BrS *in* Y*, then* Y *is an* A-(i,j)-BrS *in* X*.*

Proof. Let $\alpha_0 \in D$ and Y_{α_0} be an A-(i,j)-BrS in (Y, τ_1, τ_2'). Then $Y_{\alpha_0} \in \tau_i$ and $Y_{\alpha_0} \subset Y$ imply that $Y_{\alpha_0} \in \tau_i'$. Hence, it remains to use Corollary 12.36. □

Corollary 12.64. *Let* $\{(Y_\alpha, \tau_1^\alpha < \tau_2^\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in D}$ *be a family of bitopological subspaces of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *such that* $Y = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in D} Y_\alpha \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$*. Then the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *If* Y_{α_0} *is a* $(1,2)$-BrS *in* Y *and* $Y_{\alpha_0} \in \tau_1$ *for some* $\alpha_0 \in D$*, then* Y *is a* $(1,2)$-BrS *in* X*.*
2. *If* Y_{α_0} *is an* A-$(2,1)$-BrS *in* Y *and* $Y_{\alpha_0} \in \tau_2$ *for some* $\alpha_0 \in D$*, then* Y *is an* A-$(2,1)$-BrS *in* X*.*

Proof. The conditions follows directly from Corollary 12.37. □

Corollary 12.65. *Let* $\{(Y_\alpha, \tau_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in D}$ *be a family of topological subspaces of a* TS (X, τ)*,* Y_{α_0} *be a* BrS *in* Y *and* $Y_{\alpha_0} \in \tau$ *for some* $\alpha_0 \in D$*, then* $Y = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha\in D} Y_\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ *implies that* Y *is a* BrS *in* X*.*

Theorem 12.66. *If* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$*,* $Y \in \tau_2$ *and* Y *is a* $(1,2)$-BrS *in* X*, then*

$$2\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X) \subset (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X).$$

Proof. Contrary: there is $A \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$ such that $A \,\overline{\in}\, (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$. Hence, there is a set $V' \in \tau_1' \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that $V' \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y$. Let $V \in \tau_1$, $V \cap Y = V'$ and let us prove that V is of $(1,2)$-$\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ I, i.e., $V \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(V',V)$. Since $V = (V \cap A) \cup (V \setminus A)$, by (1) of Theorem 12.16 it suffices to prove that $V \cap A$, $V \setminus A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(V',V)$. Since $A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$, $V' \subset Y \subset X$ and $V' \in \tau_1'$, by (2) of Proposition 12.34, $A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(V',X)$. Hence, by (1) of Theorem 12.16, A$\cap V \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(V',X)$. Since $A \cap V \subset V$ and $V' \subset V \subset X$, by Proposition 12.50,

$$A \cap V \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(V',X) \Longleftrightarrow A \cap V \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(V',V).$$

Now, let us prove that $V \setminus A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(V',V)$. For this purpose, taking into account (2) of Theorem 12.16, it suffices to prove $V \setminus A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(V)$ and $F_n \in 1\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(V',V)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Evidently,

$A \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{G}_\delta(X)$ implies that $V \setminus A = (X \setminus A) \cap V \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(V)$, so that $V \setminus A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$, where $F_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_2''$ in $(V, \tau_1'' < \tau_2'')$. Let us prove that $\tau_1''' \operatorname{int}(F_n \cap V') = \varnothing$ in $(V', \tau_1''' < \tau_2''')$, or equivalently, $\tau_1''' \operatorname{cl}(V' \setminus F_n) = V'$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. We have:

$$V' \cap F_n \subset V' \cap (V \setminus A) = V' \setminus A$$

and hence, $V' \setminus (V' \setminus A) \subset V' \setminus (V' \cap F_n)$ so that $V' \cap A \subset V' \setminus F_n$. Therefore, it suffices to prove that $V' = \tau_1''' \operatorname{cl}(V' \cap A)$. Since $V \in \tau_1 \subset \tau_2$, $V' \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y$ and $Y \in \tau_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V' = (V' \cap V) \cap Y \subset (\tau_2 \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y \cap V) \cap Y \subset \tau_2 \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y \cap V) \cap Y = \\ = \tau_2' \operatorname{cl}(V' \cap A) \end{aligned}$$

and so $V' = \tau_1''' \operatorname{cl}(V' \cap A)$. Thus $V' \cap A \in 1\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(V', V)$ so that $F_n \in 1\text{-}s\mathcal{B}d(V', V)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Thus, $V \setminus A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(V', V)$ and so $V \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(V', V)$, i.e., V is of $\mathcal{C}atg_{Y}$ I, which is impossible, since Y is a $(1,2)$-BrS in X. □

Corollary 12.67. *If* $(Y, \tau') \subset (X, \tau)$, $Y \in \tau$ *and* Y *is* BrS *in* X, *then* $\mathcal{G}_\delta(X) \cap \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y, X) \subset \mathcal{ND}(Y, X)$.

Furthermore, let us prove that thanks to (5) of Corollary 12.13, a countable family of 1-open 2-strongly dense relative to Y sets in (2) of Theorem 12.24 can be essentially narrowed for an A-$(2,1)$-BrS $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ in a BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$. Namely, take place

Theorem 12.68. *A* BsS $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *is an* A-$(2,1)$-BrS *in* X *if and only if the intersection of any monotone decreasing sequence of* 2*-strongly dense relative to* Y *and* 1*-open sets is* 2*-dense in* X.

Proof. Evidently, it suffices to prove that if the intersection of any monotone decreasing sequence of 2-strongly dense relative to Y and 1-open sets is 2-dense in X, then (3) of Theorem 12.24 is satisfied.

Let $A \in (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y, X)$ be any set. Then, by analogy with the proof of the implication (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) in Theorem 12.24, one can assume that $A \in 1\text{-}\mathcal{F}_\sigma(X) \cap (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y, X)$ so that $A = \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, where $A_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y, X)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. Suppose that $X \setminus A \,\overline{\in}\, 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ that is, $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus A_n) \,\overline{\in}\, 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$. Let $U_n = \bigcap\limits_{k=1}^{n} (X \setminus A_k)$ for each $n = \overline{1, \infty}$. It is obvious that $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a monotone decreasing sequence. Moreover, $X \setminus U_n = \bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{n} A_k$, where $A_k \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y, X)$ for each

$k = \overline{1,\infty}$ and $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. According to (5) of Corollary 12.13, $X \setminus U_n \in \operatorname{co}\tau_1 \cap (2,1)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)$ and so $U_n \in \tau_1$ and $\tau_2' \operatorname{int}(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(X \setminus U_n) \cap Y) = \varnothing$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Hence

$$Y \setminus \tau_2' \operatorname{int}\big(\tau_1 \operatorname{cl}(X \setminus U_n) \cap Y\big) = Y \setminus \tau_2' \operatorname{int}(Y \setminus U_n) = \\ = \tau_2' \operatorname{cl}(U_n \cap Y) = Y$$

so that $U_n \in \tau_1 \cap 2\text{-}s\mathcal{D}(Y,X)$ for each $n = \overline{1,\infty}$. Hence, by condition $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, where $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n = \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus A_n)$ and we obtain a contradiction to $\bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} (X \setminus A_n) \overline{\in} 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$. □

Corollary 12.69. *A* TsS (Y,τ') *of a* TS (X,τ) *is an* A-BrS *in* X *if and only if the intersection of any monotone decreasing sequence of strongly dense relative to* Y *open sets is dense in* X.

Clearly, if $Y \in \mathcal{D}(X)$, then Corollary 12.69 gives the characterization of a BrS Y in X.

Theorem 12.70. *Let* $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *be a* BsS *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$. *Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) Y *is an* A-(i,j)-BrS *in* X.
(2) *If* $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X) \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $X \setminus A \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ *and* $Y \subset X \setminus A$, *then* Y *is an* A-(i,j)-BrS *in* $X \setminus A$.

Proof. (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) Let Y be an A-(i,j)-BrS in X, $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X) \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ and $Y \subset X \setminus A$. If $B \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y, X \setminus A)$, then by Proposition 12.50, $B \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$ and so, by (1) of Theorem 12.16 and (3) of Theorem 12.24, $X \setminus (A \cup B) \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$. But $X \setminus (A \cup B) = (X \setminus A) \setminus B$ and so $(X \setminus A) \setminus B \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X \setminus A)$. Now, once more applying (3) of Theorem 12.24, we obtain that Y is an A-(i,j)-BrS in $X \setminus A$.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) First, let X contains nonempty subset $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)$. Then $U \in \tau_i \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ implies that $U \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$ and by (1) of Theorem 12.24, Y is an A-(i,j)-BrS in X. Now, if there is $A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X) \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that $X \setminus A \in i\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, $Y \subset X \setminus A$ and Y is an A-(i,j)-BrS in $X \setminus A$, then by Corollary 12.55, Y is an A-(i,j)-BrS in X. □

Corollary 12.71. *For a* 2*-dense* BsS $(Y, \tau_1' < \tau_2')$ *of a* BS $(X, \tau_1 < \tau_2)$ *the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) Y *is a* $(1,2)$-BrS *in* X.
(2) *If* $A \in (1,2)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X) \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $Y \subset X \setminus A$, *then* Y *is a* $(1,2)$-BrS *in* $X \setminus A$.

Proof. Evidently, $Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$ implies, on the one hand, that $Y \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X \setminus A)$ and, on the other hand, that $X \setminus A \in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$. Hence, it remains to use (2) of Corollary 12.29 together with Theorem 12.70. $\square$

Corollary 12.72. *Let* $(Y, \tau') \subset (X, \tau)$*. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. Y *is an* A-BrS *in* X.
2. *If* $A \in \mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y, X) \setminus \{\varnothing\}$, $X \setminus A \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ *and* $Y \subset X \setminus A$*, then* Y *is an* A-BrS *in* $X \setminus A$.

Clearly, if $Y \in \mathcal{D}(X)$, then Corollary 12.72 remains valid for Baire spaces.

Our last aim of Section 12 is to show that the notion of concentration of a set on a subspace is a link connecting the relative property of this subspace to be Baire in the whole space with the property of the same subspace to be Baire in itself for both the topological and the bitopological case. As we shall see below, this idea is essentially based on the density of a subspace in the whole space.

Definition 12.73. Let (Y, τ_1', τ_2') ((Y, τ')) be a BsS (TsS) of a BS (TS) (X, τ_1, τ_2) ((X, τ)). Then a subset $A \subset X$ is (i,j)-W-nowhere dense (W-nowhere dense) relative to Y if $\tau_i' \operatorname{int} \tau_j' \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) = \varnothing$ ($\tau' \operatorname{int} \tau' \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) = \varnothing$).

The families of all subsets of X which are (i,j)-W-nowhere (W-nowhere) dense relative to Y, are denoted by $(i,j)\text{-}w\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y, X)$ ($w\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y, X)$). It is evident that

$$A \in (i,j)\text{-}w\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y, X) \Longleftrightarrow A \cap Y \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y)$$

so that if $(Y, \tau') \subset (X, \tau)$, then $A \in w\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y, X) \Longleftrightarrow A \cap Y \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y)$.

Moreover, we say that a subset A of a BS (X, τ_1, τ_2) (TS (X, τ)) is j-W-concentrated (W-concentrated) on a BsS (Y, τ_1', τ_2') (TsS (Y, τ')) if $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y \subset \tau_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$ ($\tau \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y \subset \tau \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$). Clearly, if A is j-concentrated (concentrated) on Y or $Y \in \tau_j$ ($Y \in \tau$), then A is j-W-concentrated (W-concentrated) on Y.

Now, observe that if $(Y, \tau_1', \tau_2') \subset (X, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ ($(Y, \tau') \subset (X, \tau)$), $A \subset X$ and A is j-W-concentrated (W-concentrated) on Y, then

$$A \in (i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y, X) \Longleftrightarrow A \in (i,j)\text{-}wND(Y, X)$$
$$\big(A \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y, X) \Longleftrightarrow A \in w\mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}(Y, X)\big).$$

Indeed, if A is j-W-concentrated (W-concentrated) on Y, then $\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y \subset \tau_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$ ($\tau \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y \subset \tau \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$) and therefore,

$$\tau_j \operatorname{cl} A \cap Y = \tau_j \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y) \cap Y = \tau_j' \operatorname{cl}(A \cap Y)$$

$$\big(\,\tau\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y=\tau'\operatorname{cl}(A\cap Y)\,\big).$$

Thus

$$\tau'_i\operatorname{int}(\tau_j\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y)=\tau'_i\operatorname{int}\tau'_j\operatorname{cl}(A\cap Y)$$
$$\big(\,\tau'\operatorname{int}(\tau\operatorname{cl}A\cap Y)=\tau'\operatorname{int}\tau'\operatorname{cl}(A\cap Y)\,\big)$$

so that

$$A\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)\Longleftrightarrow A\cap Y\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{ND}(Y)$$
$$\big(\,A\in\mathcal{ND}(Y,X)\Longleftrightarrow A\cap Y\in\mathcal{ND}(Y)\,\big),$$
$$A\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Y,X)\Longleftrightarrow A\cap Y\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{SD}(Y)$$
$$\big(\,A\in\mathcal{SD}(Y,X)\Longleftrightarrow A\cap Y\in\mathcal{SD}(Y)\,\big).$$

Therefore, if A is j-W-concentrated (W-concentrated) on Y, then

$$A\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)\Longleftrightarrow A\cap Y\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y)$$
$$\big(\,A\in\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y,X)\Longleftrightarrow A\cap Y\in\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{I}}(Y)\,\big)$$

and so

$$A\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)\Longleftrightarrow A\cap Y\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y)$$
$$\big(\,A\in\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)\Longleftrightarrow A\cap Y\in\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y)\,\big).$$

Theorem 12.74. *If* $(Y,\tau'_1<\tau'_2)\subset(X,\tau_1<\tau_2)$ *and* $Y\in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$*, then* Y *is an* A-(i,j)-BrS *in* X *if and only if* Y *is an* A-(i,j)-BrS.

Proof. First of all, let us prove that if $Y\in 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, then $\tau_j\operatorname{cl}U=\tau_j\operatorname{cl}(U\cap Y)$ for each set $U\in\tau_i\setminus\{\varnothing\}$. Indeed, if $U\in\tau_2\setminus\{\varnothing\}$, then $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U=\tau_2\operatorname{cl}(U\cap Y)$. Hence, by (2) of Lemma 0.2.1 in [8], $\tau_1\operatorname{cl}U=\tau_1\operatorname{cl}(U\cap Y)$. Now, if $U\in\tau_1\setminus\{\varnothing\}$, then $U\in\tau_2\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ and so $\tau_2\operatorname{cl}U=\tau_2\operatorname{cl}(U\cap Y)$.

Therefore, for any set $U\in\tau_i\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ we have

$$\tau_j\operatorname{cl}U\cap Y\subset\tau_j\operatorname{cl}U=\tau_j\operatorname{cl}(U\cap Y)$$

so that, every set $U\in\tau_i\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ is j-W-concentrated on Y. By reasonings before Theorem 12.74,

$$U\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)\Longleftrightarrow U\cap Y\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y).$$

Now, let Y be an A-(i,j)-BrS in X and $U'\in\tau'_i\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ be any set. Then there is a set $U\in\tau_i\setminus\{\varnothing\}\cap(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$ such that $U\cap Y=U'$. Thus $U'\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y)$ and so Y is an A-(i,j)-BrS. Conversely, if Y is an A-(i,j)-BrS and $U\in\tau_i\setminus\{\varnothing\}$ is any set, then the set $U'=U\cap Y\in(\tau'_i\setminus\{\varnothing\})\cap(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y)$ and so $U\in(i,j)\text{-}\mathcal{C}atg_{\mathrm{II}}(Y,X)$. Thus Y is an A-(i,j)-BrS in X. □

Corollary 12.75. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 12.74 the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *Y is a $(1,2)$-*BrS *in X if and only if Y is a $(1,2)$-*BrS*.*
(2) *Y is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS *in X if and only if Y is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS*.*

Proof. (1) Follows directly from (2) of Corollary 12.29 and (4) of Theorem 4.1.6 in [8].

(2) The condition is obvious. ☐

Corollary 12.76. *Let $(Y,\tau') \subset (X,\tau)$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}(X)$. Then Y is a* BrS *in X if and only if Y is a* BrS*.*

Corollary 12.77. *If $(Y,\tau_1' < \tau_2')$ is a* BsS *of a* BS *$(X,\tau_1 <_S \tau_2)$ and $Y \in \tau_1 \cap 2$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$, then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *Y is a* 1-BrS*.*
(2) *Y is an A-$(1,2)$-*BrS*.*
(3) *Y is a $(1,2)$-*BrS*.*
(4) *Y is a* 2-BrS*.*
(5) *Y is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS*.*
(6) *Y is a $(2,1)$-*BrS*.*
(7) *Y is a* 1-BrS *in X.*
(8) *Y is an A-$(1,2)$-*BrS *in X.*
(9) *Y is a $(1,2)$-*BrS *in X.*
(10) *Y is a* 2-BrS *in X.*
(11) *Y is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS *in X.*
(12) *Y is a $(2,1)$-*BrS *in X.*
(13) *X is a* 1-BrS*.*
(14) *X is an A-$(1,2)$-*BrS*.*
(15) *X is a $(1,2)$-*BrS*.*
(16) *X is a* 2-BrS*.*
(17) *X is an A-$(2,1)$-*BrS*.*
(18) *X is a $(2,1)$-*BrS*.*

Proof. First of all, let us note that if $(Y,\tau_1' < \tau_2') \subset (X,\tau_1 < \tau_2)$, $\tau_1 <_S \tau_2$ and $Y \in 2$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$, then by (3) of Corollary 2.1.6 in [8], $\tau_1' <_S \tau_2'$. Therefore on the one hand, $\tau_1 <_S \tau_2$ and (8) of Theorem 4.1.6 in [8] give that (13) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (14) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (15) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (16) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (17) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (18) and, on the other hand, $\tau_1' <_S \tau_2'$ and the same (8) of Theorem 4.16 give that (1) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (2) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (3) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (4) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (5) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (6).

Therefore, since $Y \in 2$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$, by (1) and (2) of Corollary 12.75, (3) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (9), (5) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (11) and since 2-$\mathcal{D}(X) \subset 1$-$\mathcal{D}(X)$, Corollary 12.76 gives that (1) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (7) and (4) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (10). Moreover, by (2) of Corollary 12.29, (8) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (9). Therefore, we obtain that (7) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (8) $\Longleftrightarrow$

(9) $\iff$ (10) $\iff$ (11). Since (10) $\iff$ (11) and by (2) of Proposition 12.31, (10) $\implies$ (12), it remains to prove only that (12) $\iff$ (11). But this implication is given by (1) Corollary 12.29.

Finally, since $Y \in \tau_1 \cap 2\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X) \implies Y \in \tau_1 \cap 1\text{-}\mathcal{D}(X)$, by Proposition 1.14 and Theorem 1.15 in [12], we have (1) $\iff$ (13). This completes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 12.78. *If* (Y, τ') *is a* TsS *of a* TS (X, τ) *and* $Y \in \tau \cap \mathcal{D}(X)$*, then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) Y *is a* BrS.
(2) Y *is a* BrS *in* X*.*
(3) X *is a* BrS.

References

[1] Alegre C., Ferrer J., Gregori V., On pairwise Baire bitopological spaces. *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **55**(1999), No. 1-2, 3–15.

[2] Arhangel'skii A. V., Genedi H. M. M., Beginings of the Theory of Relative Topological Properties. (Russian) *General Topology*, 3–48, *Spaces and Mappings, MGU, Moscow*, 1989.

[3] Arhangel'skii A. V., Relative topological properties and relative topological spaces. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Convergence Theory* (*Dijon*, 1994). *Topology Appl.* **70**(1996), No. 2-3, 87–99.

[4] Arhangel'skii A. V., From classic topological invariants to relative topological properties. *Sci. Math. Jpn.* **55**(2002), No. 1, 153–201.

[5] Chigogidze A. Ch., Relative dimensions. (Russian) *General topology*, 67–117, *MGU, Moscow*, 1985.

[6] Dvalishvili B. P., The dimension of bitopological spaces. (Russian) *Soobshch. Akad. Nauk Gruzin. SSR* **76**(1974), 49–52.

[7] Dvalishvili B. P., Bitopology and the Baire category theorem. *Abstr. Tartu Conf. Problems of Pure Appl. Math.*, 1990, 90–93.

[8] Dvalishvili B. P., Bitopological Spaces: Theory, Relations with Generalized Algebraic Structures, and Applications. *North-Holland Mathematics Studies,* 199. *Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam*, 2005.

[9] Dvalishvili B. P., Zero-bidimension and various classes of bitopological spaces. (ready for publication)

[10] Engelking R., General topology. Translated from the Polish by the author. Monografie Matematyczne, Tom 60. *PWN–Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw*, 1977.

[11] Fletcher P., Hoyle H. B., Patty C. W., The comparison of topologies. *Duke Math. J.* **36**(1969), 325–331.

[12] Haworth R. C., McCoy R. A., Baire spaces. *Dissertationes Math.* (*Rozprawy Mat.*) **141**(1977), 73 pp.

[13] Kelly J. C., Bitopological spaces. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **13**(1963), 71–89.

[14] Lane E. P., Bitopological spaces and quasi-unform spaces. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **17**(1967), 241–256.

[15] Lukeš J., Malý J., Zajíček L., Fine Topology Methods in Real Analysis and Potential Theory. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 1189, *Springer-Verlag, Berlin*, 1986.

[16] Patty C. W., Bitopological spaces. *Duke Math. J.* **34**(1967), 387–392.

[17] Pervin W. J., Connectedness in bitopological spaces. *Nederl. Akad Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A* 70 *Inday. Math.* **29**(1967), 369–372.

[18] Raghavan T. G., Reilly I. L., Metrizability of quasi-metric spaces. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **15**(1977), No. 1, 169–172.

[19] Ranchin D. V., On compactness modulo an ideal. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **202**(1972), 761–764.

[20] Reilly I. L., On bitopological separation properties. *Nanta Math.* **5**(1972), No. 2, 14–25.

[21] Ščepin E. V., Real functions, and spaces that are nearly normal. (Russian) *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.* **13**(1972), 1182–1196.

[22] Singal M. K., Singal A. R., On some pairwise normality conditions in bitopological spaces. *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **21**(1974), 71–81.

[23] Tkachuk V. V., On a subspace dimension. (Russian) *Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh.* **1981**, No. 2, 21–25.

[24] Tkachuk V. V. On the relative small inductive dimension. (Russian) *Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh.* **1982**, No. 5, 22–25.

[25] Todd A. R., Quasiregular, pseudocomplete, and Baire spaces. *Pacific J. Math.* **95**(1981), No. 1, 233–250.

[26] Valuyeva J., On relative dimension concepts. *Questions Answers Gen. Topology* **15**(1997), No. 1, 21–24.

[27] Weston J. D., On the comparison of topologies. *J. London Math. Soc.* **32**(1957), 342–354.